DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 767

JC 690 118

By-Lombardi, John

Student Activism in Junior Colleges: An Administrator's Views.

American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.; California Univ., Los Angeles. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Coll. Information.

Pub Date 69

Note-83p.

Available from-American Association of Junior Colleges, 1315 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($2.00)

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.25

Descriptors-*Activism, Black Power, *Junior Colleges, Mexican Americans, Negro Organizations, *Student Behavior, *Student College Relationship, *Student Participation, Student Teacher Relationship

Identifiers-*California

Beginning with an overview, the author traces the history of activism from the Berkeley Free Speech Movement to the present, noting that, while junior college activists are influenced by senior institutions, their activities are typically more moderate. Defining several activist groups and their special interests, he then discusses the new left (primarily the Students for a Democratic Society), the rightists, black students, Mexican-American students, and the elected student officers involved in the National Student Association. As for student government, he notes it has been bypassed by the activists, and efforts to participate in institutional governance are largely unsuccessful. Moving to student rights, he reviews the statements on this topic by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the organizations preparing the comprehensive "Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students." The last topics are community relations and relationships between students, faculty, and administration, where he discusses campus violence, the use of police, non-student activism, reactions to student excesses, and probable consequences. In conclusion, he assesses the effects of activism on curriculum and instruction and on students, and reviews areas of future concern, including the possibility of backlash. (MC)

ED028767

STUDENT ACTIVISM IN JUNIOR COLLEGES:

An Administrator's Views

By John Lombardi

JC 690 118

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information / American Association of Junior Colleges

MONOGRAPH SERIES

Salvage, Redirection, or Custody? Remedial Education in the Community Junior College. By John E. Roueche. 1968. $2.00.

Junior College Institutional Research: The State of the Art. By John E. Roueche and John R. Boggs. 1968. $2.00.

Personality Characteristics of College and University Faculty: Implications for the Community College. By Florence B. Brawer. 1968. $2.00.

Measuring Faculty Performance. By Arthur M. Cohen and Florence B. Brawer. 1969. $2.00.

Institutional Administrator or Educational Leader? The Junior College President. By Arthur M. Cohen and John E. Roueche. 1969. $2.00.

Student Activism in Junior Colleges: An Administrator's Views. By John Lombardi. 1969. $2.00.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

STUDENT ACTIVISM IN JUNIOR COLLEGES:

An Administrator's Views

By John Lombardi

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

APR 14 1969

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information
American Association of Junior Colleges
Monograph Series

Price: $2.00

American Association of Junior Colleges
1315 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Printed in U.S.A.

FOREWORD

In bringing a focus on student activism in the junior colleges, John Lombardi and the editors of the ERIC Clearinghouse monograph series are to be congratulated for exploring an area overlaid with confusion, misunderstanding, and emotional extremes. The author's first step is to assist his readers in understanding some of the distinctions between the goals and styles of different activist groupings. He includes: the New Left, Black Power, Mexican-Americans, rightists, student body officers, and others. Lombardi notes that student government has been bypassed by the activists. "Student body officers are considered, at best, part of the administrative process and, at worst, stooges for the administration . . . ." Our author then perceives that "The potentially stabilizing force of peer disapproval does not operate to effect peace on campus."

From considerations of anomie and the generation gap, Lombardi systematically discusses the events, the issues and the causes. Dr. Lombardi anticipates a trend which spreads as if by contagion and in which the students at the junior colleges imitate their counterparts at four-year institutions. Sometimes the style is imitated and sometimes the content. For example, students at one junior college demanded that the school nurse dispense birth control pills—a popular rallying point at universities—when, in fact, she is not authorized to dispense aspirin.

Further, Dr. Lombardi undertakes the exploration of paternalism and authoritarianism on the part of administrators. He demonstrates the pervasive ambivalence toward change through activists' methods which they generally consider unacceptable. Yet throughout this monograph one is made to realize that the long overdue need for change persists despite one's view of the self-appointed champions. Significantly, Lombardi reminds us that administrators do "not (have) a license to return to the preactivist era."

A facile approach is denied the reader in exchange for a multidimensional description of challenging, irritating, and provocative phenomena, presented by the mildly dissident to the wildly unreasonable, and sometimes violent and destructive, students and nonstudents. The inflexibility of the Establishment in the face of needed updating of the educational system is exposed. The problem is traced from the inception of student activism at Berkeley to its infiltration of the junior colleges.

This monograph is carefully documented. Chapters relating to the "Joint Statement on Rights and Freedom of Students" and the A.A.U.P. statement "On Student Status" (in which Dr. Lombardi lists major concerns of students and discusses current successes of the demands) offer not only interpretation but the reprinting of the important documents themselves. There are a tremendous number of useful insights into the functioning and malfunctioning of the American college and university.

Educators must be wary lest they join forces with elements of the outside community who may put forward parochial attitudes about activism. This paper takes us away from the idea of classifying all dissidents as psychopaths and all of conformity as normal or even in the best public interest. In a society of total conformity the mind and body are imprisoned. Where once we had wilderness for rugged individualism, the campuses have become frontiers for the spirit, but frontiers are disturbing places.

John Lombardi has written an erudite and dispassionate review of student activism. The monograph is a significant contribution to the literature at all levels. Dr. Lombardi stimulates us to rethink our own attitudes and thus helps to promote a rational approach to this highly volatile subject.

Robert S. Berns

Consultant in Social Psychiatry
University of California, Los Angeles

PREFACE

This monograph, the sixth in the Clearinghouse/AAJC series, represents a departure from the pattern set by the first five in that it does not report results of a survey or series of experiments. Rather, it brings together the views of a concerned, respected leader on a topic of great import today.

The monograph is a concise overview of all forms of student "activism," its causes and the responses to it. It places activism in a context of history and the broader society, and is itself a plea for avoiding overreaction to the situation. Of particular note are the author's comments regarding the "Alice in Wonderland" nature of officially sanctioned student activities and relationships between those and activism. Curiously, as he points out, only about 5 per cent to 10 per cent of the students on any junior college campus are involved in student activities *or* in student activism—although, of course, it is not the same students who take part in both sets of happenings.

John Lombardi, assistant superintendent of the Los Angeles City School Districts, is well known nationally in the junior college field. He has been an instructor, dean, and president prior to his coming to his present position and has served on many AAJC commissions. Robert Berns, who prepared the foreword, works with students, faculty, and administrators at U.C.L.A.

This monograph follows a Clearinghouse topical paper, *Student Activism and the Junior College Administrator: Judicial Guidelines,* in which Dale Gaddy, a member of the Clearinghouse staff, reviewed judicial decisions involving student rights. Taken together, the publications bring considered opinions to bear on the issue. Copies of the topical paper are available from the Clearinghouse on request.

Our thanks to the American Association of Junior Colleges and the U.S. Office of Education's ERIC project for making these publications possible.

Arthur M. Cohen
ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information

CONTENTS

		Page
Foreword		I
Preface		III
Introduction		VII
Chapter I.	**Overview**	1
Chapter II.	**Student Activist Groupings**	12
Chapter III.	**Student Body Government in Today's Colleges**	26
Chapter IV.	**Student Rights Defined**	34
Chapter V.	**The College Campus: A Community Institution**	45
Chapter VI.	**Student-Faculty-Administrator Interactions**	53
Chapter VII.	**Assessment**	61
Bibliography		71

INTRODUCTION

The turmoil besetting junior colleges continues to be milder than that in the state colleges and universities. Yet, as pointed out in the study, this may not always be true unless junior college administrators learn from the experiences of the state college and university administrators. Several junior colleges are potentially explosive either because of student composition, proximity to senior institutions, administrative weakness, or simply because activist leaders consider them good targets for publicity and maintenance of their leadership positions.

The future historians of today's activism will have at their disposal an unusually large body of materials: documents; studies; reports; court cases; newspaper and magazine articles; many short-lived manifestos, handbills, and activist house organs; official statements of administrators, faculties, alumni organizations, and civic groups; theories; and opinions. Many of the sources are in the files of the colleges and are usually available to interested individuals.

This treatise is necessarily a tentative description and interpretation of activism in the junior colleges. It is my hope that it will encourage others to undertake studies to supplement or supplant this account. In no area of junior college education is there less study than on this.

Many more people deserve recognition for helping me prepare this treatise than appear in the footnotes. To attempt to name all of them would be impossible. I take this opportunity to acknowledge my indebtedness to them. My professional colleagues have been generous in telling me about activism on their campuses. Some of my statements may not reflect conditions as they interpret them. If I have gone too far from the truth, I ask their indulgence. To all of them I am grateful.

OVERVIEW

chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Students, because of their large numbers; because of their alertness to the world; because of their desire to participate in the struggles on campus, in the community, and in the world; and because of their activism, are attracting unusual, mostly unfavorable, attention. During this decade junior college students have been more active outside the classroom than at any time since the 1930's. Today, activism revolves around the uneasiness created by the Vietnam war, the draft, racial disturbances, and deterioration of our cities, dissatisfaction with the status quo, the feeling of anomie in large institutions, and moral indignation at injustices—national and international. Some attribute part of the uneasiness to those students who are finding it "difficult to look at what's happening in the world today and not to feel guilty at being a comfortable middle class person."*

Some also talk of a generation gap, the distrust of the young for anyone over thirty. The generation gap talk may be related to the impatience of youth with the long period of "initiation" they must undergo before being permitted to assume responsibility for their own activities and for the conduct of business, civic, college, and political affairs. They may also be frustrated because, while "consciously rejecting and refusing the old world, they are finding it difficult to invent the new" (26:51).**

Theories on the causes of this decade's student activism are as numerous as those applied to the origins of World War I. S. L. Halleck, professor of psychiatry at the University of Wisconsin, has cataloged fifteen hypotheses with the warning:

---

* *Students and Society: Report on a Conference.* Occasional Paper published by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, California. Conferees were student activists and senior fellows of the Center.

** Bracketed numbers refer to bibliographical entries on pages 71-74.

No hypothesis thus far advanced can be considered a sufficient explanation of student unrest. At best, each is only a partial explanation which sheds only a small light upon a highly complex phenomenon (33).

ABSENCE OF STUDIES

With few exceptions, reports, studies, and descriptions of student activism are about events on four-year and university campuses. A check of the thirty possible references from the *Education Index, Social Sciences and Humanities Index, Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature,* and a year's issue of the *Junior College Journal* produced only one item on activism in the junior colleges (69:7-12). In the August 1968 issue of *College and University Business,* devoted to "Student Power in America: An Assessment," the only reference to the junior college is a statement by Professor Sid Walton of Merritt College, Oakland, California, that "Ideally, black schools, black school districts, black universities are needed" (84:48).

As a consequence, many illustrations of activities must be taken from those occurring in senior institutions, from the writer's personal knowledge of events in institutions with which he has been associated, or from accounts given to him by other junior college personnel.

DEFINITION OF ACTIVISM

Ordinarily activism is defined as those campus activities in which students are in conflict with administrators or, less frequently, with instructors or other students. Student activism sometimes extends into the community from the campus and, at other times, starts in the community and is brought to the campus.

Student activism, however, includes more than conflict. It includes activities in which students become members of "Establishment" organizations such as Young Republicans and Young Democrats, organize tutorial groups to help pupils in low socioeconomic areas and in migrant farm workers' camps, volunteer to participate in civil rights causes, enlist in the Peace Corps, solicit books for colleges in underdeveloped countries, or form international clubs to help foreign students make a more satisfactory adjustment to American life. These "positive aspects" may also include "student concern with curriculum and its relevance, with socially acceptable action coming out of open forum debate, and teaching excellence."*

---

* University of California *Bulletin* 16:3; November 27, 1967, quoting Santa Barbara, California, *News Press.* See also Information Bulletin No. 22, August 12, 1968. To: Junior College Superintendents and Presidents, Faculty Association and Senate Presidents, From: Archie L. McPherran, Acting Chief Executive Officer, Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

But these more temperate activities are not the ingredients of publicity and notoriety. Nor are they the elements that bring about rapid changes in the organization or in the customs, traditions, and rules of campus life. In this discussion of student activism, emphasis will be on those activities that engender "conflict" rather than on those that form the normal program of student life. Stress will be placed on the movements variously called student revolt, black revolt, student left, New Left, or student power.

FREE SPEECH MOVEMENT

Any discussion of student activism must begin with the Free Speech Movement (F.S.M.) at Berkeley, which is to student activism what the fall of the Bastille is to the French Revolution. It was a student rebellion that has few parallels in our educational history. It attracted large numbers of students, received unusual support from the faculty, and, for a time, brought educational activities to a grinding halt. Although similar, but not so extensive and dramatic, outbursts occurred at other colleges about the same time, F.S.M. has become the model and the measure of all subsequent student outbursts.*

The authors of *it's happening,* extolled F.S.M. in these words:

> If there is any one moment that is the glory of the New Left, it must be that night in December 1964, when policemen dragged several hundred live bodies from the Berkeley campus . . . For many the Sproul Hall sit-in is synonymous with "The Day"—the day radicals came of age, brought a university to a virtual chaotic standstill. . . . To students and former students across the country, the Free Speech Movement lived in the very image of the young generation's aspirations . . . (76:135-6).

The community and the university, however, have taken a different view. They were shaken so severely that neither has fully recovered. The Reagan attack on President Clark Kerr and the university can be considered in part as a fulfillment of campaign promises to his extreme conservative followers. Even some of the original supporters of F.S.M. recoiled when it seemed to get out of hand. They joined the conservatives in applauding the judges who imposed stiff sentences on the students involved.

---

* References to F.S.M. are legion—every newspaper and magazine had articles by participants and observers. In addition, *California Monthly,* the alumni magazine for Berkeley, February 1965, contains a full description of the F.S.M. *Full Text of the Byrne Report to the Regents' Committee.* Jerome C. Byrne was special counsel. This edition was reprinted from the *Los Angeles Times, May 12, 1965,* which also contains pictures of F.S.M. incidents.

Between these extremes are those who look on this activism as an encouraging sign for tomorrow's leaders. Students, this group believes, should be concerned about the great social and political issues of the day, rather than spilling their pent-up energy on panty raids and resort-area brawls (16:9). But some junior college educators, who "would feel that there was something wrong with our educational system were (student activism) not present," add: "this observation, of course, does not apply to the potentialities for disruption of the educational process which exist when some of the (extreme) militancies . . . are present" (64:5).

Since F.S.M., college campuses throughout the country have been under attack by student activists. Exceeding most attacks in intensity of violence and in extent of disruptive effect on the operations of the university was the "Columbia Crisis" of April 23-30, 1968, which involved Black Power and Students for a Democratic Society (S.D.S.) activists. Similar incidents have also occurred at other colleges but the "Columbia Crisis" has now joined F.S.M. as a landmark in the history of student activism.

MODERATE ACTIVISM IN JUNIOR COLLEGES

Junior colleges have also been affected by student activism but nothing that has happened is comparable to the Berkeley or the Columbia crises. In comparison with the turmoil on four-year campuses, junior colleges have been relatively calm, even though, to the presidents of colleges presently confronting activist students, this can be of little comfort. Therefore, in describing student activism in the junior colleges, it is important to emphasize the lesser intensity of the activism and its accompanying violence.

A survey of the views of junior college presidents' wives revealed that they did not consider students as one of "the three of greatest pressures on the president." Don A. Morgan, former president, Big Bend Community College, Washington, concluded from this response and from another in which "students represent a significant source of satisfaction derived by the president" that:

> It is a tentative suggestion that no estrangement exists between two-year college presidents and students at these (154) schools, at least as seen by the presidents' wives . . . " (23).

Significant also is the absence of serious political concern of the kind expressed by public officials and citizens over the activism present in the colleges and universities. California Governor Reagan's "sick campus community" letter was directed to state college trustees and University of California regents with no reference to junior colleges (57:3). Likewise, in his position paper on education, the governor's critical remarks are directed at the state colleges and university faculty members and administrators who "have lacked courage to expel students whose real goals are patently not academic and to dismiss instructors who betray their academic calling through disruptive and violent activities on the campus" (58:13).

As in four-year colleges and universities, the number of activists is a tiny fraction of the total student body. Even among Black Power advocates, the number of blacks is small but the 2 per cent of the students who are the activists—black, white, brown—make up in organization, agressiveness, strategy, outside resources, idealism, and wiliness what they lack in numbers.

The statement about the moderate character of activism on junior college campuses does not imply that conditions are ideal. Obviously, students on many campuses do not consider them so; but demands for admission of more students from minority groups—a favorite activist topic—cannot be too convincing on campuses with large enrollments of such students. In New York City, blacks and Puerto Ricans comprise 25 per cent of the students in public two-year colleges compared with 8 per cent in public four-year colleges.* In some junior colleges the proportion of blacks exceeds 25 per cent; in several it is almost 75 per cent. In one college, one-third of the students have Spanish surnames.** Also, junior colleges not only admit large numbers of minority students but they offer programs to help them remedy cultural, economic, and educational deficiencies. Nor can demands for scholarships create much activity since junior colleges have low or no tuition, living and other expenses are lower than on four-year campuses, and most junior college students work part time. An exception to the above statement needs to be mentioned. Junior college teaching and administrative staffs do not have an adequate representation of minority groups. More will be said about this on page 67.

Two other possible contributing factors to the milder activism are:

1. The counseling and guidance services, which help the freshman adjust to the new environment of the college and the sophomore to prepare for a job or transfer to a four-year college or university. Throughout his stay in college, the student not only has these services at his call but is also importuned to avail himself of them. The student is made to feel he has an identity.

2. The strong student personnel administrative divisions that insure that someone at a high level is responsible and is expected to act when crises involving students occur. Student personnel officers on junior college campuses have status comparable to that of other administrative officers and have not been hampered in the exercise of their responsibilities by faculty senates. Junior college senates, which have come into

---

* James G. Fulton of Pennsylvania in House of Representatives. "Community Colleges Have an Important Role in National Education." *Congressional Record,* July 17, 1968, p. 3.

** Los Angeles City Schools. *Racial and Ethnic Survey,* Fall 1967, p. 89-90 and "Minority Students in California" *The California Professor* (Published by California Teachers Association) 2:2; May 1968.

existence only in the last five years, have not yet acquired the power and prestige of the four-year college and university senates.

Junior college students may also be less active not only because they are less mature than four-year college students but also because they are more dependent on their own resources. They do not have the freedom made possible by financial support from home. Since they must work to continue in college, they cannot demonstrate for days on end; they can only participate in demonstrations for an hour or two on any one day because the job awaits them. Also, they either live at home or in off-campus dwellings. Many of those who ordinarily would become the leaders of activist groups get campus jobs or grants to act as tutors, student counselors, or teaching aides. As they accept such assignments, they temper their militant behavior.

Another reason for the milder aspect of activism on junior college campuses is the absence of professionals, who often may be "planted" on four-year and university campuses. Leaders of revolutionary organizations have concentrated their efforts and financial resources on the larger arena where disruptive activities have greater potential for revolution. Bringing prominent colleges and universities to a halt attracts more attention than similar activity on junior college campuses.

Still another reason for the milder form of activism may be inferred from studies that reveal that patterns of activism are related to kind and size of institution. Large public and private universities were found "relatively permissive in regard to student freedom to discuss controversial topics, invite off-campus speakers, demonstrate actively, and engage in civil rights activity." At the teachers' colleges, "there was less than average freedom" in these areas (65:306-11). Junior colleges were not included in either study but, if we assume a positive relationship between activism and aptitude, intellectual interest and venturesomeness, the description of junior college students by Cross will permit placing junior colleges alongside teachers' colleges. In Cross's description, junior college students (1) "achieve lower mean scores on academic ability"; (2) "tend to have lower socioeconomic status than comparably selected samples of four-year college and university students"; (3) "do not seek an intellectual atmosphere, nor do they find it"; and (4) "are more likely to be cautious and controlled, less likely to be venturesome and flexible in their thinking" (24).

The Burton Clark-Martin Trow typology also indicates that "vocationalists" are more likely to accept institutional values and "consistently score relatively low on the College Student Questionnaire's (CSQ) measures of cultural sophistication, social conscience, and liberalism" (65:299-301).

Other studies indicate that dormitory students are more inclined to be activists than commuting students (48:3-4). Whites have attacked dormitory living rules, while blacks have attacked alleged discriminatory practices.

Another clue to the incidence of activism on junior college campuses is size. Peterson claims that "the relative prevalence of organized student activism concerning off-campus political and social issues in the large institutions is probably less the result of multiversity-induced alienation than it is a reflection of the gross numbers of diverse individuals brought together at one time and place" (65:311-312). In a large institution almost any issue will attract some students. Since junior colleges are still comparatively small, they do not offer the opportunity for this type of activism. Even among junior college campuses, however, a positive relation exists between size and extent of activism.

INFLUENCE OF UNIVERSITY ACTIVISM

Much of the activity on junior college campuses is influenced by that on four-year college and university campuses. Although it is difficult to document a direct cause-and-effect relationship, it seems as if junior college students and their advisors take their cues from their counterparts in senior colleges on nearly every issue. The F.S.M. outbreak was followed by similar incidents, though on a greatly reduced scale, at junior colleges. Such is true also of anti-Vietnam vigils and demonstrations, teach-ins, experimental colleges, anti-draft and draft-card-burning incidents, and Black Power eruptions. Sometimes the imitative practice has a humorous twist. Students at Merritt College sought signatures to a petition "to have contraceptives dispensed through the college nurse (who, incidentally cannot dispense anything, even aspirin)" (69:9).

Often loose liaisons are created among students and instructors of neighboring junior and senior colleges. At two Los Angeles colleges, leaders were former students of four-year colleges who had transferred. At Merritt College in Oakland, "many of the protest activities . . . are financed by funds from U.C. or raised for U.C." (69:8). In October 1967, the president and nine members of the Compton College Black Students Union attended a demonstration at Los Angeles City College to support a "brother." City College students reciprocated the next month at a rally at Compton College.* At Ohlone College in Fremont, California, students from Chabot, a junior college, and from Hayward, a state college, participated in the April 1968 International Students Strike against war (63). In fact "much of the impetus for specific action on a campus comes from outside, from other campuses, and . . . from national student organizations" (77:10).

Former President Edward H. Redford of Merritt College, Oakland, California, surmised that not only students but also many of our faculty like to think of themselves as working in the shadow of the Campanile (the Berkeley bell tower) (69:8). The appearance in junior college newspapers of such headlines as "Pitzer-Type 'Council' Could Push Freedom" (53), and the extensive treatment of happenings in the state colleges and universities attest at least to an absorbing interest in such activities by the editors. Reciprocally, in some places, junior colleges become testing grounds for university demonstrations and places for raising funds for such demonstrations (69:8).

---

* "Incidents of Major Student Activism at Compton College." Foster Davidoff to the author, September 14, 1968.

Just as students and instructors watch developments at senior colleges, so do administrators. Their actions and policies tend to follow rather than lead in these areas. The relaxation of rules on student conduct and dress, the more permissive attitude on free speech and off-campus speakers, and the modification of strict censorship policies on student publications are examples of areas where junior college administrators have been influenced by senior college practices. The state college and university professors who serve on junior college governing boards also help create a more permissive attitude toward student activism based on the practices in their institutions.

Procedural due process in the junior colleges is being patterned after the precedents established in cases involving four-year college and university students. (See page 39). In recent months the firmer stand taken by college and university presidents toward student excesses is encouraging junior college presidents to follow a similar policy.

Two meetings of the University of California, Los Angeles, Junior College Leadership Program Advisory Council, composed of approximately thirty-five junior college presidents in the southern part of the state, illustrate the point being made that administrators are influenced by the experiences of their university colleagues in dealing with student activism. On March 31, 1966, former U.C.L.A. Chancellor Franklin D. Murphy addressed thirty-two presidents on "The Student and the Administrator in Higher Education, 1966." After outlining the "plan or format within which student activists are required to live," he told the presidents:

> The U.C.L.A. plan to which all have agreed, is based upon three rules:
>
> 1. Freedom of expression is allowed all, so long as the normal business of the university remains uninterrupted.
>
> 2. The right of privacy must be preserved. No group has the right to impose views on another.
>
> 3. Due process must be provided. Mechanisms for adjudication must be "perfected."*

As a result of the junior college administrators' interest in this meeting, B. Lamar Johnson, director of the U.C.L.A. Junior College Leadership Program, sponsored another meeting on February 8, 1968, with Dr. Murphy and included, for obvious reasons, the dean of students, Byron H. Atkinson, and the psychiatrist-in-residence, Robert Berns, who had been appointed by the chancellor in 1966. By this time, activism had become a more serious problem for all administrators, not only for the Berkeley group. Dr. Murphy's opening comment, "We are dealing with a moving target," set a different tone for the meeting from that in 1966. Whereas in 1966 Dr. Murphy expressed guarded optimism, in 1968 he was not so hopeful. His answer to the question, "What might the U.C.L.A. Junior College Leadership Program do to train new administrators?" was:

---

* Advisory Council for Junior College Leadership Program, University of California (Los Angeles). Minutes of meeting, March 31, 1966. Mimeo.

> Confrontation is essential. The administrator must be prepared to live dangerously. Worry over issues is apt to destroy him. Open-mindedness is a prerequisite to the survival of an administrator. Leadership programs . . . should attempt to transmit these concerns to those enrolled in administrator training seminars.*

In classifying junior college activism as imitative or emulative behavior, no pejorative judgment is intended on the quality or motivation of the students. No movement as deep-seated, as widespread, as intensive as today's activism can be immune to influences from outside the academic community. Parallels of student activism with the larger conflicts in society are obvious. Even the student disturbances in foreign countries exert an influence on American students. The daily reports of student revolts at the Sorbonne and at German and Italian universities probably lend encouragement to American activists. Historical parallels are also drawn and practices, ideas, theories of previous student revolts are adopted and adapted. So, in describing junior college activism as imitative or emulative, the chief inference is the great influence of university activism. That four-year colleges and universities should be the inspiration, if not the source, of activism on junior college campuses should not be surprising, since they are the institutions to which many junior college students aspire. If four-year colleges and universities did not exist, junior college activism would have arisen, but probably in an even milder form than the present.

TRAPPINGS OF ACTIVISTS

Characteristic of campus activists is the adoption of insignia of various kinds. Black activists affect African dress, hair styles, beards, earrings, and necklaces with certain charms or emblems attached. Some wear berets, jackets with insignias, and shirts or sweaters with "Black Power," "Malcolm X," or his picture imprinted on them. Many change their names to African. Ron Karenga, a leader in the Southern California Black Power Movement, used to be Ron Everett as student body president at Los Angeles City College. A former president of the Black Students Union changed his name from James Johnson to Rashidi, which means "Director of the Right Path." Other changed names and meanings are Sikivu (Dedicated and Attentive Lion), Tawli (Tall, Graceful, Black, and Beautiful), Imani (Brother of Faith) (50).

---

* *Ibid.;* Minutes of meeting, February 8, 1968. Mimeo.

Mexican-American and other activists may adopt Castro or Guevara-style beards imitating the "barbudos." Armbands also appear, especially during demonstrations. Few campuses have matched Columbia's five differently colored armbands. Black and brown armbands predominate on junior college campuses. Black, of course, may represent either black students or "mourning" over some alleged objectionable administrative action or decision. Black lapel bars are worn "in mourning" for those killed and maimed in Vietnam. Brown armbands, berets, and jackets similar to those worn by Cuban revolutionists are often worn by Mexican-American students. Armbands may be used as insignias for leaders and/or as symbols of membership in or sympathy for the cause. Other equipment of activists includes tables, chairs, signs, and placards, with and without wooden standards, handbills, leaflets, newspapers, bullhorns, and, occasionally, transistor-equipped public address systems. The more extreme groups may display Red, Mexican, or Cuban flags, may carry knives, firearms, or just bullets, or may use bombs and other incendiary materials. A Los Angeles City College activist, in protest against alleged police brutality, appeared in an executioner's outfit before the chief of police who was addressing a student body assembly.

ACTIVITIES IN JUNIOR COLLEGES

An enumeration of activities, taken mostly from incidents occurring in California junior colleges, indicates the kind and extent of the activism:

1. Presence of nonstudents on campus
2. Frequent presence of members of militant noncollege black organizations, (Black Panthers, Muslims) to get members, raise defense funds, sell newspapers, etc.
3. Disruption of cafeteria and study rooms by card-playing students and nonstudents. (One cafeteria was closed until a plan for coping with the problem was devised)
4. Students armed with knives and guns
5. Threats of bodily harm to security officers, faculty, and administrators
6. Coercion of students with threats of violence
7. Attacks on student newspaper editors
8. Confiscation by activists of student newspapers with "objectionable" material
9. Sale and/or distribution of "underground" papers, such as *Los Angeles Free Press* and *The Movement* (Compton) or ones that attack the student-body paper and are usually sprinkled with four-letter words: *Alternative, Survival, MACE, Campus Forum, CAC* (Community Action Committee), *Sloth*

10. Publication of newspapers independent of faculty or administration control or support

11. Threats to burn down the college or buildings:
    a. One fire bomb thrown between portables
    b. The interiors of two offices damaged by "Molotovs"
    c. A stink bomb in the information area set up by military personnel

12. Demands of extremists for use of facilities regardless of needs of regular educational program

13. Demands for black instructors

14. Demands for curriculum changes: Afro-Asian, Afro-American, Mexican-American curriculums and courses, experimental colleges

15. Demand (successful) to cease production of *The Detective* (all-black cast) because it was derogatory to blacks

16. Numerous demonstrations protesting Vietnam, draft, censorship, etc.

17. Challenge of administrative disciplinary actions and decisions through courts

18. Failure of black athletes to cooperate with white athletes. (This statement could be made with the colors reversed)

19. Packing a state junior college conference with students and faculty sympathizers and taking over the student division of the conference

20. Demand for 51 per cent black representation on a statewide curriculum commission

21. Strikes, walkouts, and sit-ins for relaxation of dress code, increased help to minority students, higher pay for work-study students.

Though these are disturbing activities, junior colleges have not been brought to a halt nor have administrators been held as hostages or buildings occupied, except for brief periods.

STUDENT ACTIVIST GROUPINGS

chapter 2

CLASSIFICATION

Although activism takes many forms, it usually falls into four broad classifications, according to the groups of students concerned. These groupings are not mutually exclusive. Interaction and cooperation among some of them are effected, although the combinations change, depending on the issue or the form of protest. Within the groups, splinter movements exist or develop because of disagreements over methods and goals. The four groups are: (1) New Left, dominated by Students for a Democratic Society (S.D.S.), to which most of the white student leftists belong; (2) minority groups—blacks in all sections of the country, Mexican-Americans in the West and Southwest, and Puerto Ricans in the East; (3) rightists; and (4) student body officers. American Indians are sometimes classified as an activist group, but up to now they have not been a significant factor in student activism.

The first two groups comprise the New Left, a term for many liberal and radical groups with different goals, but loosely associated "on the basis of a socialist political ideology, a faith in participatory democracy and a commitment to direct social action" (65:293). In this discussion each will be treated separately.

THE NEW LEFT: S.D.S.

In this section no effort will be made to designate which statements or incidents are S.D.S.-related. Emphasis will be on activism involving white students. Originally, the New Leftists dissociated themselves from the Old Leftists and from Communist influences, even to excluding Communists from membership in their organizations. Leaders of the New Left did not subscribe to the "ideological dogmatics of the Old Left" and they did not want to bring upon its members the disabilities incurred by members of leftist groups of the 30's. S.D.S., which is today the dominant white group, was characterized in the beginning as "pluralistic (no one excluded), nondogmatic, leaderless, and decentralized" (65:297). Some students of minority races still belong to S.D.S., but the majority of black and Mexican-American activists are in separate organizations. S.D.S. has approximately 7,000 members in about 250 chapters in colleges and universities, including many junior colleges. This is a small number compared to the membership of 250,000 Young Democrats and Young Republicans (348:3).

Changes have taken place in the objectives and ideology of S.D.S. It has become a tightly controlled organization, dogmatic in approach. S.D.S. campus leaders are influenced by " 'New Communists' whose heroes are Marx and Mao . . . Che Guevara, . . . Lenin and Castro," but not the present Soviet leaders (35).

During the Columbia incident, a sympathizer, reporting on his difficulties with "self-appointed censors who grabbed the offending material I was writing from my hands," commented:

> At first, I found these interruptions only irritating. Later, when the intimidation went beyond verbal admonishments, I saw them as part of a kind of Stalinist approach to the truth that many of the radicals embraced. Nothing was to be written that did not conform with the immediate demands of the "revolution." Every word had to follow the S.D.S. line (67:23).

Because S.D.S. membership on any campus is small—it was only 200 at Columbia—the leaders of the organization act as catalysts of instigators of action. It is difficult, therefore, to determine which activities are S.D.S.-led, which are S.D.S.-inspired, and which are S.D.S.-supported. Also, although Black Power activists refuse to cooperate with S.D.S., the converse is not true. S.D.S. leaders will enter into any campus disturbance if it gives them the potential for taking control of the institution and molding, as they put it, "a world in which they and other people can live as human beings."* S.D.S. will create grievances when necessary. "In one piece of advice . . . chapter members were urged to sign up for certain courses in large numbers, and then denounce the university for its large classes!" (36).

In addition to attacks on basic social and political institutions and concepts, New Left students exhibit an egocentrism that approaches nihilism. A Stanford student, for example, writing shortly after F.S.M. made it clear that each individual must decide for himself "whether the laws are good and should be followed, or bypassed because they contradict what he believes is right." Also, "our morals, or lack of morals, show our increasing conviction that there is nothing absolute or dependable in this world, that nothing is real and no purpose is valid unless we make it so and believe in it" (29:54). Another said: "We can't speak for anyone else—just ourselves. So there's no point in negotiating with us" (70:8). In building "a radical movement for radical social change," these students seek "authority to direct it towards ends they consider moral." Such quotations could be multiplied many times.*

---

* Open Letter. Mark Rudd, head of Columbia S.D.S. to the president, quoted in Grayson Kirk, president "A Message to Alumni, Parents, and Other Friends of Columbia." June 1, 1968.

Politically, activists would replace representative democracy with participatory democracy, "since no one can adequately represent anyone but himself," even though, as Vice-Chancellor Rosemary Park points out, this involves 29,000 students at the University of California, Los Angeles.

In general, activists maintain they "want power . . . for the same reason that all other people want power . . . to run their own lives or to control their own environment, whether they are students in a university, or blacks in the ghetto, or citizens in a democracy. Power is the first requirement for any type of change. And, I don't think it's fair to say that people must specify their ultimate or even their short-range goals before you give them power" (10).

On junior college campuses New Left activism has been associated with anti-Vietnam demonstrations, protests against military recruiting, censorship of student publications, restrictions on off-campus speakers, demands for Hyde Park-type free speech areas, and more control of student finances, student activities, and student disciplinary action. The many restrictions on students lead to individual actions, such as the filing of a damage suit by the Student Body Association against the dean of students of Shasta College (California) because he countermanded a decision of the association to charge admission to a dance. This incident may also have been associated with the expulsion by the board of trustees of a student who violated "probation imposed after he invited members of the Socialist Workers Party to distribute leaflets on campus."**

BLACK POWER

A second form of activism involves students from minority groups, the most numerous and active being the blacks. Black student groups, particularly the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), form a part of the New Left. In the early days they participated with white groups, but, "after a period of black-white populism, SNCC organizers began to lose faith in white liberals" (65:296). The black student groups are variously named Black Muslims, US, Afro-American Student Union (AASU), Black Students Union (BSU), United Black Students (UBS), Soul Students, and Endeavor To Raise Our Size (EROS). Almost universally, at the insistence of Black Power militants, "black" has replaced "Negro" as the name for the racial group. Now, among black militants, Negro has a connotation of subservience to the whites, and is used derisively toward blacks who cooperate with the whites.

---

* Quotations from Stanford professors who supported the May 1968, anti-C.I.A. sit-ins, *Los Angeles Times*, Section C, June 23, 1968.

** Item supplied by Dean Harry Carlson, Los Angeles Trade-Technical College, undated.

When black student activists were associated with whites, demands were mild, centering on the introduction of courses in Negro history, support of civil rights, desegregation of schools and colleges, and open housing. On junior college campuses, white students often took the lead in presenting petitions for Negro history and literature courses.

Today, because of disillusionment with progress in these and other areas, Black Power has become more than just a student activist movement. Black Power or Black Revolt relates to a deeper concern of the blacks with their relationship to white society, with the plight of the blacks in the ghetto, and with the emergence of a black ethnic and cultural renaissance, and a psychological change in self-appraisal. Hilton Clark, a successful black, expressed the larger dimension of this attitude:

> We felt we were lost, mentally, in a white college . . . we didn't know who we were, and we were trying to become something we would not be. We had lost all connections with the reality of what we were.*

The present demands for courses in Afro-American history and literature are part of the "identity-building tool for blacks," in contrast with the aims of the civil rightists who wanted both whites and blacks to understand Negro history (88:12). President Norvell Smith of Merritt College favors strengthening black curriculums as a means of focusing "upon the need to reinforce the identity of the Afro-American student" (68:1).

Increasing the number of black instructors ranks with the curriculum as a critical issue in the Black Power program on junior college campuses. President Smith did not exaggerate when he said the faculty at Merritt (and, he could have added, at nearly all other junior colleges) was a "closed group until a couple of years ago" (68:1). The situation today is only slightly improved in this regard. (See page 54 for further comment.)

The separatist ideology now so prominent in the Black Power movement had its origins in the Muslim (Malcolm X) group, which had a minor impact on campuses back in the 1950's and early 60's.** "Malcolm X . . . perhaps best embodied the belief that racism was so deeply ingrained in white America that appeals to conscience would bring no fundamental change" (42:232).

From the Muslims came the creed of today's Black Power militants: that blackness is a virtue, "all blacks are beautiful, good, and oppressed," and "no whites can be trusted" (85:3).

---

* As quoted by Ernest Dunbar in "The Black Revolt Hits the White Campus." *Look*, October 31, 1967.

** The Kerner Report, p. 321-336, has an account of the emergence of Black Power with a critical evaluation of its meaning.

Blacks have created a loyalty to themselves as a primary group, in opposition to adherence to a larger group—the nation, the human race. This attitude is observable at public gatherings where militant blacks sit while the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag is recited. Militant black leaders also have a distrust of "liberal" Negroes second only to their distrust of liberal whites.

On campus, contrary to state laws, contrary to previous insistence on desegregation of white student organizations, black militants are now organizing *de facto* segregated black organizations. Whether or not the constitutions of the black groups include a discriminatory clause, whites are being excluded or discouraged from joining, because none of them can relate to the needs of blacks (43:30). The Black Student Union of Laney College (California) not only destroyed the constitution of its predecessor, The Negro Culture Club, because it provided for admission of whites to membership, but has refused to comply with an Inter-Club Council rule requiring clubs to submit constitutions for approval (87).

In January 1968, a symposium of the Association of Black Students passed resolutions including one "that black people should remove all white people from membership in their organizations" (18:46). "Sustenance for the black power movement is derived from the attempt to block the trend toward interdependence and integration" (85:4).

A liberal faculty member at Los Angeles Valley College felt the intensity of this feeling when a black speaker replied to his question on how he could help the black cause with the blunt statement that a white could never be a soul brother to a black. The Columbia incident, in which the blacks ordered the whites out of their building, is only another of many such expressions of noncooperation. Bitterness against white racism is deep-seated.

The more militant of the black groups threaten and sometimes use force to accomplish their aims. On campuses, they have been known to carry knives and guns, to use fire bombs, and to threaten bodily harm to security officers, instructors, administrators, and students.* Coercion is applied also to black students who do not subscribe to the extremist tactics of the black student groups. Such students, according to the Association of Black Students, are "traitors" who should be dealt with by a "Black Mafia" (18:46).

Through these means and through negotiations, Black Power groups have obtained concessions of various kinds, particularly the addition of courses and curriculums in Afro-American culture and Swahili, and the assignment of black instructors, counselors, and a few administrators. They have forced student newspapers to substitute "black" for "Negro" and to feature more news about blacks; they have persuaded students to withdraw funds for the production of "The Detective" because it was offensive to them; they have forced white instructors to resign from

---

* See *Peralta Colleges Bulletin,* January 12, 1968.

Negro history courses; they have broken up a dance sponsored by another student group because the noise interfered with their forum; and they have become luncheon "guests" of a college president after making demands for free food.

Black Power has given black activists a sense of being part of an historical drama with the first act set in Africa, the second in pre-Black Power America, and the final act in a promised land in America. Ron Karenga, one of the leaders in Southern California, borrowing from Chinese custom, heightens his harangues before black student audiences with a chronology in which each year has a particular significance: 1965—year of revolt; 1966—year of black power; 1967—year of young lions; 1968—year of Black Panther; 1969—year of separation; and 1971—year of the guerrilla (52).

Campus administrators deal cautiously with these militant black groups, many of which contain nonstudents among their membership. The caution relates not only to fear of campus violence but also to the relationship of campus activism to community militancy. Off-campus and on-campus interaction in junior colleges seems to be closer among black students than it is among white activists. In the San Francisco-Oakland area, the extremely militant Black Panther group is closely associated with black student activism. Lately, the group has spread to Los Angeles and other parts of the country. As another example of anticipated interaction, the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., aroused a great deal of concern and uneasiness among administrators of junior colleges with large black student enrollments, whereas the assassination of Senator Robert Kennedy did not elicit the same concern because administrators did not expect trouble among white (or black) students.

As with other militant groups, the blacks are divided according to the goals they pursue, the degree of their espousal of the cause of separatism, and their adherence to nonviolence. On junior college campuses, Black Power student groups have been much more active than white, Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, or other minority groups. Incidents approaching those on four-year college and university campuses have occurred in only a few junior colleges, usually those with a large proportion of black students.

If this trend toward self-identity and separatism is carried to its extreme position, neither administrators nor student body officers, white or black, will make progress in securing cooperation, even by abdicating their responsibilities to the militant black leaders. The latter require the curtailment of institutionalized racism, but, since they have convinced themselves that "all whites are racists perpetuating racist institutions and communities" (85:3), even this would not bring about cooperation. Stokely Carmichael and Charles Hamilton, two radical blacks, admit the possibility of cooperation, but only if "the black people organize themselves first, define interests and goals . . . ." "Black Power simply says: enter coalitions only after you are able to 'stand on your own' " (11:58).

As may be inferred from this discussion, black activists have developed a pattern that includes organizing as a club, preparing a position paper or a list of demands, presenting the demands to the president of the college, announcing their position at a mass meeting, and instigating an incident against the newspaper, an instructor, or an activity. The paper may have an elaborate title such as "Position Paper of the Black Student Body on the Educational Responsibilities of Cuyahoga Community College"* or a simple call "To All Black Students of L.A.C.C."** The titles may be different but the general tenor of the papers is the same whether prepared in Cleveland, Los Angeles, Chicago, or San Jose.† They probably have origins in the position papers prepared by Black Power leaders at national conferences.‡

The features of the position papers include: (1) an introductory paragraph on the "new attitude . . . within the Black student bodies of American college campuses," on the sufferings of the black man under a society that fosters racism, and the determination of black students "to alter the picture for America's benefit as well as our own"; (2) a list of demands for curriculum changes, including special space for and more books on black literature, history, and culture; increased black representation in administration, counseling, and instruction; removal of white instructors from courses in Afro-American history; greater representation of black students in student government and on the newspaper staff; grievance boards to investigate "racist policies" in various departments and discriminatory practices in activities such as selection of the homecoming king and queen; scholarships, jobs, paid tutoring programs, and transportation for ghetto youth; subsidies for a black press; and office space for the club; and (3) a request for a meeting with the president "to discuss acceptance of these demands . . . ."

MEXICAN-AMERICAN GROUPS

On some California campuses with large numbers of students of Mexican-American heritage, the United Mexican-American Students (UMAS) and/or Mexican-American Students Association (MASA) form the dominant nonblack groups. Sometimes Mexican-Americans are called Chicanos. These minority groups are not as aggressive as the black militants or the white leftists.

---

* Charles N. Pappas, vice-president and metropolitan campus director to author, September 11, 1968. The position paper was prepared about May 1968. All quotations in this discusssion are from the Cuyahoga (Cleveland, Ohio) paper.

** Glenn Gooder, president, Los Angeles City College to author, October 16, 1968. The paper was prepared in May 1968.

† Ellis M. Benson, president, San Diego Mesa College to author, October 7, 1968. Dr. Benson, dean of instruction at San Jose College, sent the materials on black student demands made on December 12, 1967. The Chicago City College incidents were reported to the author by Michael Zibrin, Jr., staff member at the Southeast Campus, October 8, 1968.

‡ "Position Paper. Five-State Organizing Committee for Community Control," addressed to Harvard Conference on Educational Subsystems. January 25, 1968. *Phi Delta Kappan* 49: 450-451; April 1968.

Mexican-American student leaders favor a Mexican-American curriculum, support Cesar Chavez, union leader of the agricultural migrant workers, and oppose "police brutality." Their objectives include scholarship programs and tutoring projects for uneducated or knowledge-hungry children, meaningful political representation in the student council, greater participation by Chicanos, and campus jobs for Mexican-American students.*

Not much enthusiasm has been expressed for Reies Lopez Tijerina, of the Alianza Federal Mercedes, who advocates the restoration of the "stolen" lands in the Southwest.

In Los Angeles, Mexican-American college students concentrate their energies in the community and in counseling the more militant Mexican-American high school students. A Los Angeles Schools Task Force reported:

> In the absence of a strong middle-class leadership, college students are filling the vacuum in East Los Angeles. UMAS (United Mexican-American Students) and MASA (Mexican-American Students Association) student organizations flourish at eight or more colleges and universities throughout the Southland. These organizations are powerful, and for lack of more constructive channels, some members have turned to militant tactics. They are currently divided as to whether they should become totally militant and anti-establishment or if they will continue to be service oriented and seek traditional solutions as originally planned (46).

Mexican-Americans, spurred on by gains made by the blacks and fearful that their passivity is causing them to be bypassed, are becoming slightly more active on campus. Community agencies such as the Latin American Civic Association, the Mexican-American Opportunities Foundation, and the Educational Clearinghouse for Central Los Angeles cooperate with campus organizations and administrators to increase the attendance of Mexican-American youth in colleges (62:6). (The Educational Clearinghouse for Central Los Angeles cooperates with all minority groups.) The Los Angeles colleges enroll large numbers of Mexican-Americans or, rather, students with Spanish surnames. At East Los Angeles, these students comprise more than one-third of the 13,000 day and evening students. City College has enrolled 2,000; Trade-Technical, 1,900; and Valley College, 1,100. In none of these colleges has a strong militant group been formed. The East Los Angeles College located in the Mexican-American area has widespread community support. At no time during the walkouts and blowouts from the East Side high schools or during the semiweekly demonstrations at board of education meetings in March and April 1968 was any criticism directed at the junior colleges.

---

* Adopted from Purposes of MASA. *Los Angeles* (City College) *Collegian*. March 1, 1968.

Separatist tendencies in the colleges are not strong. Bilingualism is not a problem; Spanish is the most popular foreign language taught. Latin American history courses are an important part of the curriculum, popular with all students, and meet the California State graduation requirement for American history. Since color is not a prominent or a disabling characteristic, Mexican-Americans are not as cut off in college by or from whites as are the blacks. In Los Angeles County 10 per cent of the six million inhabitants who are Mexican-Americans or have Spanish surnames are widely distributed throughout the county. Although concentrations vary from a high of one-third of the population to a low of less than 2 per cent, "there is no area from which Spanish surname people are completely absent and only twelve areas (out of sixty-four) where they account for less than 2 per cent of the total."* It is significant enough to point out again that the *Report* mentioned the University of California, Los Angeles, and California State College at Los Angeles for their low percentage of Mexican-American students, but did not mention any of the Los Angeles junior colleges in which large numbers of students are enrolled.

Efforts to arouse the Mexican-American students are made. For example, the Union Estudiantil Mexico-Americana of San Jose City College prepared a position paper very much like the Black Power papers, with demands for Mexican-American counselors, an advisory committee with Mexican-American students and community leaders to help resolve issues or problems, and a review of the college policies in the placement services, and in the awarding of scholarships, grants, and loans.** Similar activities appear from time to time on other campuses with large Mexican-American enrollments.

However, whether because of cultural background, ties to Mexico, less racist discrimination, or easier acceptance by whites, Mexican-American activists do not seem as impelled to aggressiveness and violence as the black activists. Overtures by the blacks for an alliance have been turned down by the Los Angeles Mexican-Americans. It may even be possible to speculate that Mexican-American students are satisfied with the treatment and the educational program they receive in the junior college. The possibility of more militancy still exists, if the high school leaders, now learning about the effectiveness of group action in bringing about changes, enroll in the junior colleges.

---

* *Education and the Mexican American Community in Los Angeles County.* A Report of the California State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. April 1968. p. 1-2.

**Benson to author, *op. cit.*

RIGHTISTS

The third group of activists are the rightists, who belong to the Young Americans for Freedom, Proud American Student Association, Young Republicans, Veterans Clubs, and groups sympathetic to the John Birch Society. These students, together with those who are apolitical, are the great majority. Their tactics differ from those displayed by other activist groups. At the California convention of Young Americans for Freedom on August 29, 1968, the delegates approved a resolution urging the government "to initiate a policy of complete military victory in South Vietnam." On the draft issue, they took the same position as leftist students, approving a resolution to end the draft and replace it with a volunteer army.* The delegates of the Young Americans were advised by California Governor Ronald Reagan to make converts of leftists with "the soft sell," pointing out to them "that to riot, parade, and demonstrate in the streets is not the answer."** Although a large number of students are "conservative," few have engaged in the kind of activism that has attracted so much attention on campuses.

Occasionally, on some campuses, members of the Catholic Newman Club are encouraged by a conservative clerical advisor to oppose the leftist groups or some particular activity or point of view. At one time, on one junior college campus, the most active conservative group was led by members of the Newman Club who opposed, by letters to the editor of the school paper and by protests to the president, every manifestation of what they considered to be Communists or Communist-inspired activity, including the appearance of Eleanor Roosevelt as a speaker.†

The rightist students are more likely to react to the activists than to originate campaigns or demonstrations, and the reaction usually appears only when the leftists become aggressive or violent. At Columbia, for example, a group of students, opposed to the activists occupying the buildings, formed "The Majority Coalition." At City College (New York), a middle group of moderates composed of members of Student Government, the Interfraternity Council, and House Plan emerged in opposition to the methods of protest (70:7). At Los Angeles City College, a group of students attacked a speaker because he displayed the Red flag instead of the American flag on his podium. Had an administrator not intervened, the speaker would have been assaulted.

So far, such appearances have been sporadic and not well organized. Occasionally, a junior college administrator will encourage or organize physical education or police-science students and/or instructors to help combat the activities of white leftist groups. Where Black Power groups are strong, this kind of confrontation, being extremely dangerous, is not used or encouraged.

---

* *Los Angeles Times,* August 31, 1968.

** *Los Angeles Times,* September 1, 1968.

† John Lombardi. "The State of the College: A Report to the Faculty of Los Angeles City College, September 1961." p. 11. Mimeo. Gordon C. Zahn. "From the Groves of Salamanca . . . to the Shores of Tripoli." p. 231-253 in Theodore Rozak. *The Dissenting Academy.* New York, Random House, 1967, analyzes the relative absence of activism on Catholic college campuses and sets forth possible reasons for the conservatism of Catholic students.

Periodically, a mild flurry of conservative activity appears on campuses, but nothing significant happens. For a time Ayn Rand had a sizable following, as did Senator Barry Goldwater during his presidential campaign. Today, Young Americans for Freedom is the dominant organization insofar as activity is concerned. Although, as mentioned above, the Young Republicans are strong in numbers on many campuses, violent activism of the right has not materialized. Perhaps the resurgence of Republicanism may encourage more activity, either in opposition to the leftists or in support of conservative traditions, institutions, and values. This need not mean defense of the status quo.

Militating against the growth of a strong, active rightist movement are the liberal faculty members. As will be described later, faculty support student activism up to a point. A few conservative faculty members try to counteract the drift toward the left, but up to now have been unsuccessful. As long as this remains so, rightist activity will be handicapped because "the faculty within which students are enrolled seems more predictive of their political stands than class origins." Moreover, "attendance at a university is stronger in pressing well-to-do students to a position to the left of their parents, than in moving those from less-privileged Democratic and liberal families to the right" (48:4-5).

This faculty influence is exerted in the classroom, on student-faculty committees, and in student organizations. One illustration of such negative influence on rightist activities was the cancellation of a conservative speaker's appearance at East Los Angeles College because of the opposition of two liberal faculty members serving on the Special Lecture Forum Committee. The student newspaper quoted one of the two as saying the only conservative he would authorize was Russell Kirk (28).

STUDENT BODY OFFICERS AND N.S.A.

The elected student body officers and councilmen form a fourth group of student activists. Their role on the individual campuses in the present era is discussed elsewhere. (See page 29.)

Student body officers also participate in the National Student Association, a prominent segment of student activism composed of 368 members representing colleges and universities. Junior colleges have not been active in N.S.A., partly because it is dominated by students from senior institutions and partly because junior college administrators have discouraged participation, believing it to be a radical organization.

For a time in 1967, N.S.A. officers had difficulty over the disclosure that for fifteen years the Central Intelligence Agency had provided up to 80 per cent of the organization's budget. Prompt action on the part of the Association's National Supervisory Board, ordering "the complete and permanent severance of all ties with C.I.A." and disclosing the nature of the ties, helped prevent defections among member colleges. The fact that member colleges did not know of the ties and that the C.I.A. was interested primarily in information about foreign student movements also contributed to the feeling that the domestic program had not been subverted by the subsidies (12:8).

N.S.A. received recognition in 1966 as the most representative national student organization when it was included in the ten national groups that prepared the Student Bill of Rights. Edward Schwartz, then national affairs vice-president, was selected as a member of the Joint Drafting Committee (15:78). (See page 37 for a discussion of the Bill of Rights.)

Because of the wide diversity and the institutional representation of N.S.A. membership, its program until the last two years tended to be closer to the center than to the left. During the last two years, however, its leaders have guided the organization toward a more activist program. In 1968, at the Twenty-First National Student Congress, the program adopted under its theme, "Student Power: Coming of Age," confirmed the trend that started in 1967, when the slogan "Student Power," so reminiscent of "Black Power," was first used. In its brochure, the leaders of N.S.A. wrote that 1967-68 was to be the "Year of Student Power . . . the year in which students across the country sought participation in curriculum, sought decision-making power in areas basic to university life." Other predictions dealt with the challenge of the university's relation to Vietnam and the draft, student course and teacher evaluations, and participation on faculty curriculum committees. Except for the omission of a plank for "restructuring the university and society," the Student Power platform could hardly be distinguished from that of S.D.S. Despite the similarity of objectives, S.D.S. leaders were scornful of N.S.A. leaders, considering them an arm of the Establishment (6:1).

This shift toward activism had its dangers for an organization representing a wide group of student government leaders. At its 1968 Congress, a two-day debate on white racism almost disrupted the conference. A black commission of fifty Negro and Mexican-American delegates, after meeting with Dick Gregory, prepared a list of ten conditions that had to be met by N.S.A. before the commission would resume participation in the Congress (86).

N.S.A. leaders, interested in acquainting junior colleges with its services and special programs, invited the commission to send representatives to the 1968 National Student Congress. In the future they will likely concentrate on obtaining more junior college participation.

OTHER GROUPS

A peripheral group sometimes associated with colleges is the "hippies." Actually, the hippies are not activists and not even necessarily college students. Their chief characteristic is irresponsibility and alienation from society in a way foreign to activists, who want to create a revolution to transform the colleges and universities. The hippies have exerted an influence on all youths, including college students. Young people have adopted the hippies' style in long hair, beards, clothing, shoes, or lack of shoes. Closely associated with the hippies, probably an offshoot, are the street people, the most widely publicized being the Berkeley Commune, who congregate near the campus. Another group calls itself "Up Against the Wall." A reporter characterized the street people as heirs of the Free Speech Movement and of the hippies. From the former, "they took militancy"; from the latter, "they took irresponsibility" (27).

SUMMARY

The aims of the various groups may be summed up in the statement by Edward Schwartz, then vice-president of N.S.A., that the "Student Power movement is designed to gain for students their full rights to democratically control their nonacademic lives and participate to the fullest in the administrative and decision-making process of the college."[*]

Characteristic of student activism are the racial, ethnic, and religious overtones among the various groups. Blacks, Mexican-Americans, and Puerto Ricans organized themselves by design on identifiable racial and ethnic traits. Their reason for being depends upon this classification. The blacks went a step beyond by excluding other racial or ethnic groups from membership in their organizations. This separatist principle is not part of the program of the other minority groups.

N.S.A. is an inclusive organization embracing student leaders from all racial, ethnic, and religious groups. S.D.S., not by choice, has become a white organization, with a large Jewish membership and leadership.[**] The rightist groups are dominated by white Protestants and Catholics, with the former in the ascendancy.

This condition among student activist groups parallels many of the divisions in society. As in society, instead of a horizontal amalgamation or melding of the various strains in the student bodies, a series of vertical groupings seems to have formed in our colleges. The melting-pot notion, as Glazer and Moynihan concluded about New York City, as "an idea close to the heart of the American self-image," has not yet happened in the colleges (32:288).

Most students in American colleges are not associated with activist groups. Although some may be sympathetic with one or more of the activists' goals and may occasionally participate in demonstrations, and although recruits from among them make it possible to start some form of agitation on almost any issue, most students are probably not interested in activism.

---

[*] *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* 1:7; August 23, 1967, quoting National Student Association goal.

[**] Arthur Hertzberg. "The Affluent Surface." *Saturday Review* 51: 25; July 6, 1968, and William Trombley, "Raid Clouds Future of Promising [Stony Brook] University." *Los Angeles Times* July 4, 1968.

The activists, it must be repeated, represent only a small number of the student bodies in the colleges. Few white, black, Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, Catholic, Jewish, or Protestant students are affiliated with any student-activist groups. What was said about the membership composition of the various groups related only to that fact. From the analysis of racial or ethnic or religious affiliations, no conclusion can be reached regarding the views or attitude of an individual student toward a particular program of an activist group. It should be noted that many students of all classifications are either apathetic toward or mildly sympathetic with the aims of the militants. Accordingly, the potentially stabilizing force of peer disapproval does not operate to effect peace on the campus.

STUDENT BODY GOVERNMENT IN TODAY'S COLLEGES

chapter 3

A survey of junior college campuses prompts several observations on the relationship of student government to activism, the role of the college newspaper, the imitative behavior of junior college students, and the apathy of most students. The changes affecting the role of students in the governance of their own affairs and in the administration of the college are also significant.

STUDENT GOVERNMENT AND ACTIVISM

In this active period in student relations, the regularly constituted student body officers have been bypassed. Activism more often than not originates outside the elected student body organization. Student body officers find themselves taking sides on issues that originate with groups sometimes not even affiliated with the student body. Agitation at Ventura College for dress reform came from a group that felt that the student body officers were being cowed by the college president. The Student Freedom Forum in the Los Angeles colleges tried to force the associated student body officers to act on the issue of an inside versus an outside free-speech area. The representatives of The Forum, not the student body officers, appeared before the board of education for a change in policy.

Most of the Black Power and S.D.S. incidents at Los Angeles City and Valley Colleges, Merritt and Laney Colleges in Oakland, San Jose City College, Compton College, and other colleges were led, and are still being led, by individuals other than the regularly elected student body officers. With few exceptions, the elected leaders of the students have become followers.

A notable exception was the determined resistance of student body officers of Ohlone College to the suggestion of members of the board of trustees that they take an oath of allegiance like the one all academic employees must take. In the long summer controversy, the student body president and the secretary resigned in protest over the board's insistence on the loyalty oath.* Another was the protest on March 28, 1968, of the Western Piedmont (North Carolina) Community College Government Association. They demanded that a student dismissed for allegedly having or drinking beer on campus be reinstated because the administrative action was "undemocratic, unconstitutional, and an insult to the Student Government Association and the Constitution."**

The New Left and Black Power advocates rarely cooperate with the regularly constituted student government leaders, having as much contempt for them as for the administration. Student body officers are considered, at best, part of the administrative process and, at worst, stooges of the administration, "lackeys of the worst sort."

Student governments are considered "powerless and designed to stay that way." In the New Left handbook, "The New Radicals in the Multiversity," Carl Davidson saw the possibility of using student government as a temporary vehicle for building a grass-roots, student-power movement. He looked upon the student body offices as vantage points or soap boxes enabling the New Leftists to gain "a kind of visibility and [an opportunity to speak] to the student body as a whole." Student body funds would be useful for bringing to the campus, "certain speakers, films, [and] . . . conferences" (25:52).

Even without this attitude of the activists, leadership in the movement cannot be assumed by student body leaders, since they are committed to an orderly process of government, a process that does not move fast enough in times of stress to satisfy the activists of the New Left and Black Power. By its very name, activism implies fast motion in a given direction.

Student body officers have influenced certain nonsensitive areas of interest to the student body. On some of these issues, student officers have been the leaders; in others, supporters of the activists or individual groups. Among these were petitions for: (1) the right to smoke in the library or other areas; (2) keeping the library open on Saturdays and Sundays; (3) free speech, including a "Hyde Park" area and the right to invite any speaker; (4) permission to sell the *Free Press* and distribute other literature; (5) continuance of midyear graduation; and (6) setting up information booths on alternatives to the draft. Some also participated, before the Black Power movement, in campaigns for introduction of courses in Negro history and for open housing for black students. All of the issues placed on the ballot have usually been sponsored by or processed through the student council. The new student-faculty-administration disciplinary bodies are becoming an important adjunct of student body government. Issues involved conflict with existing regulations and a challenge to administrative authority or community practices.

---

* Stephen E. Epler, president, Ohlone College, letter to author. September 3, 1968. (President Epler also sent copies of clippings of the local papers *The Argus* and *News Register,* August 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 27, 28, 1968.)

** Raymond E. Schultz, professor at Florida State University to the author, August 24, 1968.

THE COLLEGE NEWSPAPER

College newspaper editors have more influence than elected student leaders in formulating issues and taking positions on controversial questions. The editors reflect or mold student opinions more faithfully than any other campus group. To be fair to the student body officers, one must point out that it is easier to pass judgment on other people's actions than it is to make decisions and to formulate policies. Nevertheless, student editors rival student body presidents in their influence on college campuses. The Black Students Union attacks on student editors at one of the state colleges and at one of the Los Angeles colleges illustrate this point. The attacks would not have been made if the perpetrators thought that student editors and college newspapers were devoid of influence.

The management of the newspaper has been an issue on campus. Who should determine editorial policy? Should the editors of the campus paper have the right to criticize the student body council, which "owns" the paper? May the "owners" determine how much news should be given to student body activities? Is the campus paper a house organ, or is it a miniature newspaper modeled after the *Free Press* or the metropolitan newspapers?

In the conflict between the college editors and the student body officers, the editors usually come out on top, but in a dispute with the Black Students Union on the Los Angeles City College campus, they were temporarily defeated. On the grounds of the paper's alleged racism, support of Wallace's presidential candidacy, and refusal to print unedited views of their members, the Black Students Union destroyed an issue of the college newspaper, threatened violence on the editors, and persuaded the administration to order a change in the format of the college newspaper by substituting an expanded letters-to-the-editor section for the editorial page and the term "black" for "Negro." These administratively directed changes caused the resignation of the excutive editor and other members of his staff. Later, on recommendation of a faculty-student-administration committee, the editorial page was restored, but the expanded letters-to-the-editor section was continued. As before, the term "black" was substituted for "Negro" (49).

Student body officers and others who are dissatisfied with the regular college newspaper sometimes resort to "underground" newspapers such as *MACE* at Los Angeles Valley College, *Survival* and *Alternative* at Los

Angeles Harbor College, *Sloth* at Ventura College, and *Campus Forum* at El Camino College, or to competitive organs such as *Mother's Milk* at Los Angeles City College, or *Salmagundi* at Pine Manor Junior College in Massachusetts.

STUDENT APATHY

Another observation is the apparent lack of student interest in student government and clubs. Students are reluctant to stand for election or to accept assignments. Only a few students take time to vote at student body elections and many campus clubs have difficulty recruiting members. A turnout of 10 per cent at elections is considered high. In each of two successive elections at one college, fewer than 600 out of 7,000 students voted for student body officers. In another, only 374 out of 4,000 students voted. At many elections, few of the student body offices, including the presidency, are contested.

The indifference of students to elections is not confined to junior colleges. At Berkeley in a recent election, only 17 per cent of the undergraduates voted (1:10-11). Student body officers at Stanford* and the Irvine campus of the University of California** resigned in despair because of lack of student interest and inability to effect changes in the institutions. A junior college faculty member commented that "the only thing that would cause these junior college kids to go into action would be the chance of getting some of the faculty's parking slots" (71:41). As noted previously, an exception was the resignation at Ohlone College (Fremont, California) of the president and secretary because of the board of trustees' insistence on a loyalty oath.

In an effort to arouse student interest in elections, student body officers resort to opinion-polling. Appearing on the election ballots are questions relating to Vietnam, the draft, personnel recruiting by manufacturers of war materials, military advisement days, smoking in the library or in some other forbidden area, and similar topics of wide student interest. The large turnout at such elections contrasts sharply with the low turnout at elections with no poll-taking.

BREAKDOWN OF STUDENT GOVERNMENT

Organizationally, student body government has relied too much on the model of political government. A substitute for elective office has not been found, nor has a method of representing a wider spectrum of the student body. In the student body councils, restrictions are so numerous that a large part of the time is devoted to forms and procedures. Robert's Rules of Order and the parliamentarians often stultify deliberations. "Preoccupation with method, technique, and procedure gains a subtle dominance over the whole process of goal seeking. *How* it is done becomes more important than *whether* it is done" (31:47). In print, the issues the student councils discuss seem trivial and petty. An alumni report on the Columbia situation also recommended "a more effective body for self-government than the present University Student Council" (83:16).

---

* *The Stanford Daily*, February 23 and 27, 1967.

** As reported in *El Gaucho* (University of California, Santa Barbara), February 16, 1968.

Inertia affects every institution. In student government, custom determines the names of the student offices, the activities and organizations to be sponsored, and the amount of money to be allocated as rigidly as the mores and taboos of primitive societies. Moreover, administrators place obstacles in the way of change, especially if they are not in sympathy with the student proposals. They do not want students "to rock the boat" or to offend this or that community group with radical ideas. It is easier for them to approve or disapprove a familiar program than to try to determine whether or not a new program is proper for the college. Finally, tenure is too short for student officers to accomplish much. Almost as soon as they take office, their terms end.

A good deal of student body government has a touch of Alice in Wonderland. For example, although the bookstore is a student activity, the students have little or no participation in formulating policy, in selecting employees, or in determining items to be sold. Only occasionally are students able to force administrators to lower prices on store items, especially on used texts. The only benefit students get from this activity is the profit. The make-believe nature of much student body government relates to other areas as well. Students provide the funds for the newspaper, but rarely have a say in the selection of the editor and his staff. The case is similar in the control of the student activities office where student body workers are employed. The intercollegiate athletics program usually has the largest appropriation of any activity, but students have little representation on athletic committees and virtually no voice in the selection of coaches.

Student budget-making is often just an exercise. Since such a large proportion of the budget is earmarked for salaries and for continuing activities in athletics, journalism, theater arts, and music, little initiative is left to the students. Commitments by previous officers and administrators are made to seem mandatory. In California, although the student body fee is voluntary, some college administrators make it seem mandatory by requiring students during the registration procedure to pass through a station where membership cards are sold. Where students have challenged this subterfuge, they have forced the administration to make membership voluntary. In these colleges, memberships have declined, as have the activities supported by these funds. To counteract this trend, student body officers, through their regional and state associations, have sponsored legislation for compulsory student body fees, another illustration of a minority attempting to impose its will on the majority! And administrators through their association are supporting the minority!

An exception to this has been reported for the Peralta District Colleges in Oakland, California, where the students have been given far more authority to conduct their affairs than in any other district. The Associated Students of Merritt College in the district "employs its own business manager and operates both the college store, the cafeteria, and the vending machines" (69:10). As described elsewhere, district policies on freedom of speech, of assembly, and of the press are extremely liberal. Students participate in the governance of the college through membership on the Merritt Council, "composed of deans and assistant deans, plus an equal number of senators appointed by the president of the Associated Students with the president of the College presiding" (69:10). The student body fee is voluntary. Since only about 30 to 40 per cent of the students pay the fee, the district budgets funds for student body activities. This is not as radical as some of the other reforms, since most districts make sizable budgetary allotments to various student activities.

LEGAL STATUS OF STUDENTS

The student officers' unrealistic expectations relate to the nature of the institution and the responsibilities of the college administration as imposed by law, and by state and local regulations. A college is not a political institution; a student is not a citizen in the political sense. The student's status is more akin to that of a client. Although student government is not yet a right, a body of legal precedents is developing, modifying the principle that self-government is a privilege granted by law or by the college.

Considerable progress has been made in modifying the restrictive relationships that flow from the doctrine of *in loco parentis.* Although California junior colleges are still classified as secondary institutions, in practice they are treated as institutions of higher education. Administrators and faculty generally treat students as adults, not as minors.

EFFORTS TO REVIVE INTEREST

To make student body office-holding more attractive, student body councils at Los Angeles Valley and Pierce Colleges voted to pay student body officers monthly salaries of $30 to $75 for their services. Besides the monetary inducement, it is believed a salary would enable working students to run for and hold office without jeopardizing their scholastic standing; the salary would make it unnecessary for them to work while in office. The precedent, if successful, should spread to other colleges, where some already pay student editors, sports editors, and advertising managers. The various subsidies to athletes in the form of food, campus jobs, and other benefits could be considered precedents for this move (56) (54).

Student participation in college-wide committees is a trend in many colleges. The extent to which it goes beyond tokenism will determine its effectiveness in reviving interest in student body government. Interethnic committees, Afro-American studies committees, and administrative-executive councils are some groups that have shown promise.*

It is doubtful that the present form of activism led by S.D.S. and Black Power students will be moderated by any such measures unless they involve capitulation to the activists' demands. Peralta Colleges' experiences with Black Power students have been as difficult as those of other colleges in the state with strong Black Power groups. Sociologically, "revolutions are more likely to grow after rather than before grievances have been redressed because then people are on the way from despair to the realization of rising expectations" (4:4). This does not mean, however, that students should not have more self-determination.

PARTICIPATION IN COLLEGE GOVERNMENT

Student activism has had two main objectives: freedom from restrictive rules and participation in the governance of the college. Considerable advance has been made in the first objective, very little on the second. Junior college students have been given places on college committees, and presidents' round tables and student opinion centers have been established; but little student participation in the governance of the colleges has resulted. Some criticize administrators and faculty for resistance or "cautious acceptance." Tokenism has characterized these efforts (77:6).

Even with the best will, not much can be done to change the relationship of junior college students to the governance of the college. Too few of them are interested. A student editor, Joe Suarez, analyzed the difficulty when he observed:

> Junior college isn't a place where things get done on a large scale. It's hard to get parking lots paved; to get better cafeteria service; to give away 5,000 school papers to a 20,000 member student body . . . When the jukebox was removed from the Breakaway, there were many cries of *'Et tu, Brute?'* but they soon died after the realization by these students that they would have to go through a long and involved process to get it back. . . . But let someone start an argument on black power in the Breakaway, or start a flagpole rally which disrupts classes, distribute literature illegally, or have an outside speaker on campus illegally, then everyone wants to get into the act (78).

Mr. Suarez was unintentionally telling the administrators of the college that they could extend more opportunities for "participatory democracy" without danger of getting too many students to accept! He summarized the difficulties involved in student participation as student apathy and administrative red tape.

---

* For a discussion of the possible student role in the curriculum area see: Charles B. Neff, "The Administrative Challenge of the New Student Activism." *Journal of Higher Education* 39: 70; February 1968.

Notwithstanding these obstacles, some junior college administrators believe "a vast reservoir of [student] energy and talent," will continue to go to waste unless students are "taken into the inner sanctum of the management of the college." The administrators' reluctance is difficult to understand because it "can be done without turning the institution over to the students who, in a two-year college, can accurately be described as transients."*

The student editor of the *Pierce College Roundup* also believed in involvement as a way of giving students "a more effective voice in the direct governing of every aspect of campus life." The remedy was an adaptation of the council of students and faculty in operation at Pitzer College in the Claremont colleges cluster. Again, administrators are assured "this move toward more student freedom doesn't mean the students will be running the college. It merely suggests the power of organized support for a need; and rarely does a college president veto a recommendation which has . . . strong support from student and faculty members" (79).

The vagueness of the proposals for student participation in the governance of the college is a measure of the difficulty of trying to create a situation that may have little meaning. Rather than concentrating on devising ways for students to participate in the governance of the college, administrators should place priority on giving students more freedom to conduct their own activities. Efforts to reshape student government so that students really control their activities will be more productive and will be more relevant to them. Students will not be self-governing if members of the board of trustees or administrators attempt to force students to require loyalty oaths or a fixed number of signatures for a petition, or certain scholarship standards for office holding. Mickey Mouse is still Mickey Mouse whether he is on the screen, in a comic book, or walking around at Disneyland.

---

* John Collins, president, Moorpark College, Ventura, California, quoted in Simonsen, *op. cit*, p. 28.

STUDENT RIGHTS DEFINED

chapter 4

THREE STATEMENTS

For the second time in a short period, the academic community has been forced to reexamine many of its practices, regulations, and customs. First was the reexamination of the curriculum and educational programs that followed the launching of Sputnik by the Russians. No sooner had administrators made their adjustments to this clamor for educational reform than they were struck by the more disturbing revolt of students. Both movements resulted in action of various kinds by educational associations, legislatures, commissions, and individuals. In addition to campus, legislative, and court actions, student activism has resulted in several statements on student rights, three of which have special significance in understanding the impact of student activism on administrative policy.

The 1966 American Association of University Professors' "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities" includes two sections on students, a paragraph in the preface, and a section, "On Student Status," at the end. In the same year the American Council on Education prepared a "Statement on Confidentiality of Student Records." The most inclusive of these documents, the "Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students," (reprinted in topical paper No. 3, "Student Activism and the Junior College Administrator: Judicial Guidelines." ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information) was the joint effort of a committee of seven representing five national organizations. On the committee was one junior college administrator, Ann Bromley, associate dean of Students, Santa Fe Junior College, Gainesville, Florida, who represented the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors.*

---

* The other four organizations were the American Association of University Professors, Association of American Colleges, the U.S. National Students Association, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities," is reprinted in the Winter 1966 issue of the *AAUP Bulletin*. The "Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students" has been reproduced and published widely. *College and University Business* 45, July 1968 had an insert, "Administrator's Handbook: Understanding the Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students." The full text of "Statement on Confidentiality of Student Records" is in *Junior College Journal*, 38: 38; November 1967.

1. Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities

The A.A.U.P. statement, while classifying students "as an institutional component coordinate in importance with trustees, administrators and faculty," contains "no main section on students" because (1) "the changes now occurring in the status of American students have plainly outdistanced the analysis by the educational community, and an attempt to define the situation without study might prove unfair to student interests," and (2) "students do not in fact presently have a significant voice in the government of colleges and universities . . . ."

The last section of the statement, "On Student Status", ends with a plea that:

> The respect of students for their college and university can be enhanced if they are given at least these opportunities: (1) to be listened to in the classroom without fear of institutional reprisal for the substance of their views; (2) freedom to discuss questions of institutional policy and operation; (3) the right to academic due process when charged with serious violations of institutional regulations; and (4) the same right to hear speakers of their own choice as is enjoyed by other components of the institution.

These four points summarize the major concerns of students today. They are listed in the order in which concessions to students have been made. Item (1) is the most difficult to achieve if "institutional reprisal" represents a euphemism for instructor reprisal. Students may have the freedom to say what they please in the classroom, but they have little redress from instructor reprisal in the form of grades. Many, probably most, administrators permit students to discuss "questions of institutional policy and operation." The courts are helping many administrators who wish to have academic or procedural due process and are forcing others to adopt some plan. On item (4), students have made tremendous gains. Nearly all junior colleges have relaxed their restrictions on speakers. Many more today permit Communists to address students than was true ten years ago.

2. Statement on Confidentiality of Student Records

In 1966, the American Council on Education, following the subpoena by the House Un-American Activities Committee "of membership lists of campus organizations known to oppose the present policies of the United States in Southeast Asia," prepared a strong statement urging college administrators to maintain the confidentiality of student records and to resist attempts by government agencies to obtain them. More, it admonished administrators against the practice of cooperating with any agencies, except under the most compelling reasons and only after having formulated "clear policies to protect the confidential nature of student records."

Concern over confidentiality of student records had been expressed by college and school authorities before 1966. Some colleges had regulations on the kind of information to be kept, how it was to be kept, to whom and under what circumstances it could be released, and by whom its release could be authorized. However, a large number of colleges, probably most public junior colleges, cooperated closely with local, state, and federal law enforcement authorities in making available student records. In a few instances, college administrators acted as campus representatives of these agencies by keeping them informed of actions of students thought to be subversive or involved in drugs, or in some other abnormal activity. Law enforcement agents received special treatment in securing information, sometimes under the administrator's misapprehension that the agents, merely by showing identification cards or badges, had a legal right of access to the students' records.

As a consequence of the practices of some chairmen of the House Un-American Activities Committee, of the late Senator Joseph McCarthy, and of the Selective Service in examining individual student records and membership lists of student organizations, administrators began reexamining their policies. A few administrators stopped requiring the filing of membership lists as a condition of recognition of student campus organizations; others maintained only records containing biographical information and grades. Many colleges discontinued compiling student rank order or standing in class for use by draft boards. Frequently, a distinction was made between official records and "unofficial" records, the former kept in the admissions office and the latter, usually anecdotal and of a more personal nature, kept in another office.

The American Council on Education statement focused attention on all of this by an analysis of the problems and by recommending that the colleges:

1. "Formulate and firmly implement clear policies to protect the confidential nature of student records."
2. Refuse to respond, "beyond the affirmation of the principle of confidentiality," to challenges of the principle without consultation with attorneys.
3. Pay "proper respect to the interests of research." Even here the "paramount" consideration is "the confidentiality of the student's record."
4. "Discontinue the maintenance of membership lists of student organizations, especially those related to matters of political belief or action."

The recommendations make clear the association's concern with the danger that membership lists and similar information, when surrendered to certain investigative bodies, may be used by others. "The use of blacklists, limited neither in time nor by honor, is a practice to which no college or university wishes to be, even inadvertently, an accessory" is the last sentence in the fourth recommendation and concludes the statement. This statement is influencing college administrators to reexamine their practices, and legislatures to reexamine the laws on this subject.* Legislation was passed replacing a provision of the Education Code that permitted access to student records by

> (d) An officer or employee of the United States, the State of California or a city, city and county, or county seeking information in the course of his duties. (Education Code Section 10751)

with

> (d) A state or local law enforcement officer, including a probation officer, parole officer or administrator, or member of a parole board seeking information in the course of his duties. (Chapter 1364 amending Education Code Section 10751).

This action in California parallels the confidentiality of teacher organization membership rolls. By law, the local boards of trustees and administrators are forbidden to demand the submission of membership lists as a requirement for recognition. Under the terms of the state's Winton Act, an impartial auditing firm is required to determine the number of members on the roll of any organization seeking representation on the Negotiating Council. If teachers need this protection, how much more important it is for students.**

3. Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students

The significance of the third statement on student rights lies in its comprehensiveness, particularly in the fact that every important issue revolving around student activism is discussed. Its various sections embrace the essence of the other statements. "Section III, Student Records" is a shorter version of the American Association of Colleges' statement. "Section II, In the Classroom" and "Section IV, Student Affairs" cover other topics found in the "Confidentiality of Student Records" statement. This document contains most of the second of the *three* documents. Similarly, "Section IV C, Student Participation in Institutional Government" and "Section IV D, Student Publications" cover the same ground as the A.A.U.P. Statement.

In addition, the joint statement contains extended sections on "Off-Campus Freedom of Students" and "Procedural Standards in Disciplinary Proceedings." The first of these contains material not found in the other two statements; the second is a much more detailed guide for colleges than the short paragraph in the A.A.U.P. statement.

Some of the proposals in the joint statement represent ideals that are not always practiced, however much lip service may be given to them by educators. For example, the introduction to Section II advises: "The professor in the classroom and in conference should encourage free discussion, inquiry, and expression. Student performance should be evaluated solely on an academic basis, not on opinions or conduct in matters unrelated to academic standards." But nowhere in the three subsections that follow (or in any other part of the document) are guidelines provided for protecting the student against the instructor who violates the principles enunciated. A section "on enforcement was passed by the final drafting committee but was not included in the documents endorsed by some of the organizations." This section provided for the parties to the joint statement "to set up machinery for continuous joint interpretation of the policies and procedures" and "to consult with each other before setting up procedures . . . ."

---

* In California, House Resolution No. 495, Relative to public records, and Senate Bill No. 670 deal with the subject.

** John E. Tropman and John L. Erlich. "New Political Realities: Academia and the City." *Journal of Higher Education* 39: 305-6. This has a discussion of how student records and associations are used in ways unfavorable to the student in the contest system of social mobility.

SIGNIFICANCE OF DOCUMENTS

These documents represent an historical record of one of the most important eras in the life of American colleges and universities. In these documents, college and university administrators (and students) have restated and redefined the philosophy and purpose of higher education. In them will be found the accommodations to student criticisms of campus practices and the rationales governing the relationships between students and the faculty, administration, and community. Gathered together are the most reasonable of the proposals for reform instituted in some colleges or recommended for adoption by scholars and observers. These documents contain suggestions on the "acceptable" practices and procedures that will conform to the new freedoms won by students through conflict, persuasion, court action, and legislation.

The documents will not reverse the roles of administrator and student; they are not revolutionary; nor will they satisfy the New Leftists or S.D.S. Enthusiasm for these suggestions will be tempered by the realization that they need implementation on the campus. By themselves the documents will not restore harmony on campus. They require acceptance by administrators; they need to be converted into campus rules supplanting those that contributed to student unrest. They require a willingness "to accord students, as members of the academic community, an appropriate share in the determination of institutional policies in respect to both the instructional program and its social framework."*

These documents represent a triumph for the students of this generation, which "has unexpectedly . . . become the leaven in the lump, the party of hope, the spirit of change, the conscience of our time. For the first time in many years, one can see what it means to persist in that healthy condition of society that makes alternatives seem possible, that makes human faith possible again" (40:123).

---

* "Student Unrest." Statement of the Board of Directors of the Association of American Colleges, July 1968.

Not all colleges and university administrators will subscribe to Kazin's eulogy of students. Neither will all of them accept, immediately, all of the suggestions. For some, the proposals are too radical. Many will need time to adjust to the new order, but retreat to the status quo *ante* student activism is not possible. As the present administrators are replaced by a new generation, accommodation to the new order will be made and, after consolidation of gains, a new generation of students will seek new freedom.

PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS

All educators have been involved on-campus in the matter of regulating student conduct in activities outside the classroom—perhaps these can be classified as nonacademic or noninstructional matters. The line between these and academic or instructional matters sometimes gets blurred, but in general they include such activities as free speech, freedom of assembly, freedom to demonstrate, civil disobedience as a means of expressing dissatisfaction with a law or regulation, and similar matters. These form the principal substance of student activism. Here, too, much progress has been made by the activists, but here also is where so much conflict between the rights of students and the responsibilities of administrators arises and where so many court cases have originated.

The courts have exerted influence in many areas of student life. Through decisions on student cases, the doctrine of *in loco parentis* has disappeared in most junior colleges. Additionally, the insistence of courts on some form of due process in the disciplining of students is broadening the rights of students to an education in the public colleges. No longer is a college education considered a privilege, nor may a college arbitrarily deprive a student of his constitutional rights by statements in the catalog or by forcing the student to sign a statement as a condition of admission—a modern form of "yellow dog" contract (3:12) (37).

In general, the federal and state courts have modified or restricted the authority of the college administrators by ruling that "colleges are subject to the Constitution as are other institutions." In a New York case involving a student barred from taking regents examinations without a hearing because he had cheated on an examination, the court ruled that he had been deprived of rights under the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution by not being given a hearing with the aid of counsel (17:19).

In Alabama, a federal judge, in ordering a suspended student editor reinstated, declared: "A state cannot force a college student to forfeit his constitutionally protected right of freedom of expression as a condition of his attending a state-supported institution." In a South Carolina case, a federal judge, ruling that a college cannot put "a prior restraint on the right to freedom of speech and the right to assemble," ordered the suspension lifted against three students for leading demonstrations (66:161).

The California Supreme Court in *Goldberg* v. *Regents of the University of California* checked this trend and restored the balance between student rights and college authority. The case, which has become a landmark in this new field of law, attracted attention because it involved F.S.M. students who deliberately set out to defy university regulations by advocating "an open, fierce and thorough-going rebellion on this campus, to organize and split this campus wide open!" A sit-in in the administration building ended when the governor ordered the forceable removal of the participants. In protest at the arrest of students and nonstudents, a new F.S.M., Filthy Speech Movement, was organized and its members began using obscenities in gatherings on the campus. The university dismissed one student and suspended three. After a series of hearings and injunction proceedings, the students appealed to the Supreme Court, which held that:

> . . . in this case, the university's disciplinary action was a proper exercise of its inherent general powers to maintain order on the campus and to exclude therefrom those who are detrimental to its well-being (2:15).

Also significant was the Court's reasoning that:

> Broadly stated, the function of the university is to impart learning and to advance the boundaries of knowledge. This carries with it the administrative responsibility to control and regulate that conduct and behavior of the students which tends to impede, obstruct or threaten the achievements of its educational goals. Thus, the university has the power to formulate and enforce rules of student conduct that are appropriate and necessary to the maintenance of order and propriety, considering the accepted norms of social behavior of the community, where such rules are reasonably necessary to further the university's educational goals.

The decision recognized a distinction between the academic community and the broader social community, a distinction that, by reaffirming the special position of the academic community in society, stemmed the trend toward making the academic community subject to the same rules and regulations as the broader community. The Court observed:

> Historically, the academic community has been unique in having its own standards, rewards and punishments. Its members have been allowed to go about their business of teaching and learning largely free of outside interference. To compel such a community to recognize and enforce precisely the same standards and penalties that prevail in the broader social community would serve neither the special needs and interests of the educational institutions nor the ultimate advantages that society derives therefrom. Thus, in an academic community, greater freedoms and greater restrictions may prevail than in society at large, and the subtle fixing of these limits

should, in a large measure, be left to the educational institution itself.*

Although this decision, as was pointed out, redressed the balance between the rights of students and the responsibility of administrators to maintain order, it would be a mistake to think it restored the former unlimited authority of administrators over students. Administrators were given a breathing spell by the Goldberg decision, not a license to return to the preactivist era.

The Goldberg case must be evaluated in relation to the other cases, especially to the *Dixon* v. *Alabama* case. The procedure outlined by the judge in that case is worth reproducing for its clarity, succinctness, and appropriateness. The judge wrote:

> The student should be given the names of witnesses against him and an oral or written report on the facts to which each witness testified. He should be given the opportunity to present to the Board, or at least to an administrative official of the college, his own defense against the charges and to produce either oral or written affidavits of witnesses in his own behalf.**

This dictum has become a guide for administrators in reshaping their disciplinary procedures. It was not supplanted by the Goldberg case. In fact, Associate Justice Taylor ruled that "the hearing provided to plaintiffs more than adequately complied with the Dixon standards" (57 Cal. Rptr, 474). Procedural due process need not be as rigid or as strict as legal due process in criminal cases, but the rights of students in the academic community must not be infringed or violated. The bounds or limits of this new due process doctrine are not clear, although the California Goldberg case did set a general pattern.

Junior college administrators, like university administrators, are reexamining their student conduct regulations and their procedures for disciplining students accused of violating them. Junior college administrators had various codes before F.S.M. and the Goldberg case, but the procedural due process limits were not defined or the codes were ineffective, administratively dominated, or based on a strict *in loco parentis* interpretation more applicable to elementary and secondary pupils than to junior college students. Very few codes met the standards of the courts. Students objected, and still do, to being presented with administratively drafted rules and disciplinary committees dominated by administrators and faculty (51:3).

---

* An analysis of the implications of the Goldberg case is in William A. Kinnison, "New Power Relationships on the Campus." *Journal of Higher Education* 39: 312-313; June 1968. The author believes this paragraph has implications for faculty and nonacademic employees.

** 294 F. 2d 150 (1961) appeal from *Dixon* v. *Alabama* State Board of Education, 186 F. suppl. 945 (M.D. Ala. 196), quoted in *College and University Business* 42:60, January 1967.

Sometimes a junior college administrator is forced to defend in court his disciplinary action. This was the case when Los Angeles Valley College students challenged their suspension following a disruptive demonstration against military recruiters. The college lost the case because it failed to provide adequate procedural due process. Since then, the dean of students has taken steps to refine the standards of student conduct and to seek the cooperation of the other deans of the Los Angeles college system in drafting standards conforming to the new order. This task involves a study of practices in other colleges, of California law, and of appropriate court cases and practices in California and other states. The "Student Conduct Standards Spelled Out," by the University of California, has been influential (82).

This egalitarian development on American college campuses mirrors a similar development in society, especially its emphasis on the many manifestations of individual rights.

IN LOCO PARENTIS

Coincident with the judicial development of procedural due process in student discipline cases has been the modification of the college's responsibility toward the personal welfare and actions of the student. Parietal rules based on the doctrine of *in loco parentis* are being modified or eliminated. Formerly, college authorities acting as the surrogate parents "enforced rules of conduct and behavior governing the physical, mental, and moral lives of students" (44:309), "so long as their rules violated neither divine nor human law."* It has been considered "absurd to contend that a college could not require its students to attend chapel or could not prohibit them from marrying, walking the streets at midnight, or boarding at a public hotel."

In loco parentis was being modified long before student activists began agitating against it. Few colleges in 1960 had the kind of student regulations enumerated in the Wheaton College case. Some that had dormitory rules were modifying them; nearly all but religious colleges had given up compulsory chapel attendance and the prohibition against marrying. The doctrine lost most of its essential quality as enrollments and faculties increased and as the college became "an extension of the national economy, part and parcel of the marketplace." The large college could no longer qualify "as an extension of the American family" (44:309).

Not all educators accept the complete abdication of the college's responsibilities implied in the principle of *in loco parentis.* Alan Johnson contends:

> Colleges are agents of a democratic society, just as are the courts, but with particular responsibilities to teach, to educate. Learning about self, about society, and about self-within-society is part of the

---

* Allen B. Laidlaw. "The Legal Aspects of Student Discipline." Term Paper. Ed. 470C. University of California, Los Angeles, July 30, 1968, p. 8, quoting *People* v. *Wheaton College,* 40, Illinois, 186 (1866).

> educative process, and this learning has both emotional and rational components (39:17).

Therefore, he maintains, the college cannot ignore the implications of off-campus student actions involving, for example, conviction for participating in abortion operations, prescribing for illnesses, or selling drugs. A college would be remiss if it failed to make a judgment on the admission of such a student to a registered nursing or police science program. The college "has not only a right, but an obligation to society, to bar the student from further study" in that course (39:20).

How far the college should go in assuming jurisdiction over the "criminal charges of trespass, refusal to disperse, and resisting arrest" is being debated more on university campuses than on junior college campuses. The claim is made that, if the college takes cognizance of these cases for disciplinary action at the same time that the civil authorities do, then the students involved are placed in double jeopardy. Usually, junior college authorities are relieved when the cases are taken over by civil agencies.

Junior college educators in commuter colleges do not have the same concern for the welfare of students as their colleagues in dormitory colleges. The range of student activities involved is limited for them since rules for dormitory living, where some of the most ticklish decisions have to be made, are not necessary. Drinking in rooms, visiting privileges for members of the opposite sex, limits on evening hours, dispensing contraceptives, or providing information on them do not concern most junior college educators. Their principal concern has been with no-smoking rules; dress codes; drinking at college functions; observance of health, safety, and fire regulations; parking; and, in a few instances, control of social clubs and fraternities. Some colleges have attempted to control the housing of women students living away from home.

In "Guidelines for Student Conduct," the seven deans of students at the Los Angeles colleges defined twelve categories of "misconduct for which students are subject to discipline." Included is a catchall item: "conduct which adversely affects the student's suitability as a member of the academic community." At Fullerton Junior College, an identical code is being proposed. Both codes were copied from the one adopted by the University of California—another example of the influence of the university on the junior college (82).

The residents living near the college campus do not subscribe to the corollary that administrators have no responsibility toward the students' activities off campus. They expect action to prevent students from blocking their driveways, from littering the streets near their homes, from creating nuisances in adjoining houses, and from other disturbances connected with parties and initiations. Administrators find it increasingly difficult to discipline students for these off-campus activities and even more difficult to explain to complaining residents their lack of authority in such matters.

In another area state laws and court decisions are modifying still another "disability" of students under twenty-one. Except for certain obligations incurred in the purchase of food, clothing, and other survival necessities, a student minor until recently was unable to enter into a legally binding contract. To enable students to make such contracts under the National Defense Student Loan Program and similar measures, state legislatures are enacting laws permitting any student who has been accepted for admission to an "approved . . . institution of higher education . . . to execute a legally binding promissory note for a loan necessary to attend or to continue in attendance . . ." (3:12).

The trend of the times may be summarized in two sentences. As a result of court actions, students have gained the right of procedural due process in disciplinary cases and successfully attacked the basic principle that a college has a responsibility to influence, control, or interfere with conduct of personal lives on or off the campus. As a corollary, in relinquishing their former responsibility as surrogate parents, colleges are also giving up responsibility for students involved in off-campus difficulties or infractions of the civil or criminal law.

THE COLLEGE CAMPUS: A COMMUNITY INSTITUTION

chapter 5

NONSTUDENTS

College campuses attract many outsiders: nonstudents, police, plainclothesmen (including FBI agents), reporters, and television cameramen. Nonstudents are particularly difficult to deal with because of the openness of the campus and the reluctance of college administrators to adopt control measures. They have always been a problem of college campuses, but today, because of their relationship to student activism, they have become a special concern requiring different methods of dealing with them. Part of this problem is the touchy issue of policemen on campus.

In 1967 Merritt College's president estimated that at any one time 100 to 150 nonstudents could be counted on campus. He wondered if Merritt "shouldn't have a dean of nonstudents or even a nonstudent center," noting also that "we do have nonstudent organizations and a nonstudent newspaper" (69:7). The activities of these nonstudents in organizing card games forced the closing of a cafeteria until the administrators could devise a plan to curtail them (64:5). Administrators could institute a system of identification of nonstudents by periodic inspection of registration cards, but they hesitate to do so because of almost certain student and faculty opposition and the possibility of misinterpretation of motives.

POLICE AND CAMPUS SANCTUARY

The uniformed police and plainclothesmen who appear on campus may be there at the request of the campus authorities or on their own initiative, since the law enforcement authorities, through their intelligence units, know as soon as or earlier than the college authorities about the movements of the activists. Reporters and cameramen may be apprised of situations by the police, by the activists, or by listening to police radio announcements. For the activists, a demonstration without publicity would be a disappointment; public exposure is one of their main forms of communication.

Some campus authorities assign college cameramen to take pictures during demonstrations. Photographs are sometimes used for publicity, but mostly for identification of participants in campus disciplinary actions and in court, if appeal from campus disciplinary actions should be taken. Activists also want pictures, but they look for incidents to support their charges of "police brutality" (61:131).

So ingrained and so much a part of the mythology of college mores is the concept of sanctuary that the use of police arouses a great deal of controversy among students and faculty and often results in isolating the administration from nonactivist students and moderates on the faculty. *When and how to call in police are the most difficult decisions confronting an administrator during a demonstration.* It is almost axiomatic not to call the police unless the demonstration gets out of control. This stricture does not, of course, apply to campus police, who are expected only to keep order, not to disrupt or break up demonstrations.

The antagonism between police and minority and dissident groups is becoming an extremely serious problem in urban areas—so much so that Police Chief Thomas Reddin of Los Angeles observed:

> Through some strange process I don't understand, the policeman is now the guardian of the establishment, the protector of the *status quo*. We are seen as the villains—whenever we turn up, we are the slumlord or the war hawk!! (47:22).

Talk of police mutiny appears more and more frequently when city officials attempt to restrict police action in law enforcement in the ghettos and other minority areas. Allegations also continue to be made by minority group leaders that blacks, Mexican-Americans, and members of other minority groups are harassed and mistreated by police, and that ghettos are overpoliced.

This conflict spills over into the schools and colleges. In the August 1968 riot at the conclusion of the Watts Festival in Los Angeles, police established a command post in Locke High School, located in the center of Watts. At a meeting of the board of education, the executive secretary of the American Federation of Teachers protested this action and requested the board to "issue a public statement regarding this incident and assure the students, teachers and the community of the Inner City that our schools have not become adjuncts of the police department" (75). The members of the board gingerly discussed this delicate issue and, after most of them had stated their support of the police and their concern over the use of Locke High School, passed a resolution requesting the president of the board and the superintendent to prepare a statement for consideration by the board. The vote on the resolution was five yeas, one abstention.

Activists, because they understand the mystical quality of this long-cherished myth of campus sanctuary, will welcome, even invite, the calling of police when it suits their purpose. They also know that the mystique is heightened if the police can be placed in the position of "forcefully" and "brutally" dragging some of their members while a crowd and TV cameramen are around. If some blood can be spilled, so much the better.

Edward Schwartz, former president of the National Students Association, who understood the importance of faculty and student feeling on the principle of sanctuary, advised N.S.A. members:

> Nothing infuriates even complacent students more than the sight of their friends being dragged from picket lines to jail by the cops . . . . If we have to carry out these threats, we can count on stupid deans and irascible college presidents to make mistakes that will galvanize student opinion behind us (74:55).

One observer at Columbia wrote:

> Before that night, the angry response of students to the situation at Columbia had been channeled into opposing factions. But on the morning after the police action, most of the anger on all sides converged into a consensus of outrage directed against the forces which had called the police. The mood of the university community that morning was one of sullen bitterness (30:56).

President Grayson Kirk of Columbia University, recognizing "the strong feeling that permeates all American universities against the use of municipal police on university property . . . exhausted all other alternatives before appealing for such aid" (45). Other considerations may account for reluctance in particular situations, but this is the overriding one.

Junior college administrators have not had too many serious problems regarding the when and how of calling in the police because: (1) they have had fewer occasions when police were necessary; (2) the principle of sanctuary is not as strong on their campuses; and (3) they must rely on the police for security, as few junior colleges have the elaborate security staffs found on four-year-college and university campuses. However, feelings among junior college students and many faculty members against the use of police are strong and cannot be easily ignored. The administrators at Los Angeles Valley College discovered this when, at their request, police arrested a demonstrator who, in resisting, was injured or beaten. Black Students Union President Melvyn X of East Los Angeles College urged the student council to replace the "bookstore cops" with unarmed security guards, and condemned the administration "for knowingly allowing two armed plain-clothed police pigs to audit our rally."*

---

* Los Angeles Valley College *Campus News,* October 2, 1968, p. 1.

REACTION TO USE OF POLICE

The reluctance of administrators to call police during campus demonstrations frequently arouses unfavorable reaction, as is reflected in statements and actions by public officials and legislators. Mention has already been made of the Reagan-Kerr controversy. President John Summerskill of California State College at San Francisco resigned partly because of criticism of his failure to call police. As a result of unusually strong student demonstrations at the Los Angeles and San Francisco State College campuses, the California Assembly Education Committee was authorized in January 1968, to investigate disorders on college campuses. On the question of who should determine when to call the police, Assemblyman Leroy F. Greene, chairman of the committee, said: "We've been told by some college presidents that they want to have the final say. However, a legal opinion from our Legislative Counsel says the police are required to act, whether they're asked to or not."*

The Stony Brook (New York) raid in the early morning of January 17, 1968, illustrates the almost unlimited authority of the police to enter a campus and their total disregard of campus officials in the planning and execution of the raid. Whether or not the police action was justified or necessary does not alter the fact of the officers' indifference to the principle of sanctuary (5:1) (80).

On American college and university campuses sanctuary does not exist. Regardless of Stony Brook and other campuses that police entered unbidden, the request for police by college administrators is too widespread a practice to warrant any other conclusion than that they too reject the principle of sanctuary, although the strong faculty and student support for it makes administrators wary or reluctant to violate it.

POLICE AND ADMINISTRATION ACCOMMODATIONS

Contrary to popular opinion, police do not relish the prospect of operating on junior college campuses unless demonstrations reach dangerous proportions. Except when property or life is in danger, police in many urban areas prefer to remain aloof. Police, of course, offer college administrators advice on methods of crowd control and enter into cooperative arrangements with them on the timing of their appearance when necessary.

Administrators have mixed feelings about the counter-principle that police do not have to wait for a call from campus authorities if life or property is endangered. If the police may come without permission, administrators may be absolved of responsibility by the faculty and students. Yet, understanding the deep feeling of faculty and students on this issue, administrators are trying to placate campus personnel and conservative off-campus groups by making prior arrangements with the police, outlining the respective responsibilities and procedures for any demonstrations or incidents that may require police action.

---

* Release: From the Office of Assemblyman Leroy F. Greene. Room 3112 State Capitol, Sacramento, California, January 22, 1968. Multilithed.

One such arrangement, labeled *"Confidential:* Procedure for Handling Campus Disturbances (Demonstrations-Riots, etc.)," is current in California for the guidance of administrators. This entire document is worth reproducing because it reveals the struggle that must have gone on among administrators in reconciling conflicting interests, placating or anticipating possible public repercussions, adjusting to student demands without relinquishing too much authority, maintaining order during civil disobedience or activist demonstrations, and retaining administrative initiative on the when and how of calling police to the campus. Although the document tries to maintain much of the *status quo ante* relationship between administrators and students, the concessions to students indicate a tremendous change in the relationship. It also shows that activism is a concern on junior college campuses. The "Confidential" classification must have been applied by an extremely cautious administrator, for the document has wide circulation among college personnel.

CONFIDENTIAL

PROCEDURE FOR HANDLING CAMPUS DISTURBANCES

(Demonstrations-Riots, etc.)

..............College is an institution of higher learning which provides college experience for the purpose of developing well informed and socially adjusted students. With this premise in mind the college recognizes the need for an understanding of Civil Obedience.

Civil Disobedience is defined as 'the open, willful breaking, by an individual or a group, of a law which that individual or group believes to be unfair or unjust with a view toward effecting its change, or the committing of a similarly unlawful act in order to influence government policy.'

Contrasted with civil disobedience are dissent and protest, both lawful means of disagreement. Dissent is the legal expression of one's nonconcurrence with a generally prevailing opinion, usually by means of the spoken or written word; while protest is the legal expression of objection, disapproval or opposition, more often in the form of some type of action . . . .

I. General Information Regarding Campus Unrest—
  A. All rumors should be reported to the Dean of Men's Office who will report to Captain ...., City of .... Sheriff's Office.
    1. Sheriffs Department is interested enough and would like to know if only *one* picket is active on campus.
  B. Sheriff's department should have maps of campus layout.
  C. Sheriff's Department should be informed when Military Recruiting, Dow Chemical, controversial speakers, political speakers, etc., are on campus (speakers, observers, etc.).
    a. The college is in poor position if there is trouble resulting from an invited person.

b. Captain .... will be happy to check on representatives of groups (speakers).
II. Procedures to Follow if Demonstrations Start—
A. Administration liaison with Sheriff's Department:
1. The Dean of Men shall be the contact person on campus.
a. Next in command—Male Coordinator of Activities.
2. When outside help is needed, ... turn campus or students over to Deputies.
B. Contact person notify Sheriff's Department (Captain .... or Watch Commander).
1. Alert them ahead of time, if possible.
2. Ask for plain-clothesman to come on campus.
a. We should know when plain-clothesman is on campus.
C. Contact person and observers should be at scene of disturbance.
1. Try to sort out leaders.
D. Attempt to talk with leaders and/or group.
1. What is the problem?
2. Can we solve it peaceably?
E. If demonstration continues.
1. Phone Sheriff's Department.
a. Radio cars will be alerted.
2. Staging area set up near campus.
3. If necessary, many deputies and cars will converge on campus.
F. Administrator in charge and plain-clothesman will decide when deputies will take over and make arrests as needed.
1. The Administrator in charge may make citizens arrest of those breaking the law *not* observed by deputies.
2. The Sheriff's Department will be guided by the wishes of the college.

Penal Code 602.7—Non-Students on campus must be asked by an Administrator to leave. If they do not leave, Administrator should make a citizens arrest. (Will stand up in court.)
5/16/68

STUDENT ACTIVISM AND VIOLENCE

The violence accompanying activism on college campuses elicits varying reactions from administrators, public officials, and observers. Some look on violence as endemic—a necessary condition of life in today's world. Months before the Columbia Crisis, a professor, referring to faculty militants, warned them:

> Having publicly joined the quest for power, Mr. Chips can never again stand aloof from it, for it is now part of his public image. If teachers continue to ignore the issues of the struggle for power and

to condemn conflict and violence, now that it is a part of their own image, then education and schools become a little more absurd and teachers a little less honest.*

A great deal has been written on violence since the successive assassinations of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Robert F. Kennedy. On June 9, 1968, following Kennedy's assassination, an English paper, the *Observer Review,* featured "Violence: A Report on the Self-Questioning Mood of a Shaken Society Under the Gunman's Shadow," by its San Francisco correspondent, who wrote:

> American society is dividing more and more: as the result of Vietnam, race riots, etc., the Left is going further left, the minority groups are becoming more and more cut off from other groups, the Right is going further right. The Right especially . . . believes in very simple remedies: nuclear weapons to solve the Vietnam war; cutting student grants to stop student unrest; more and better-armed police to stop race riots.

The assassination of King was followed by rioting and looting in cities, but by surprisingly little such activity on college campuses. Junior college administrators with large numbers of black students showed unusual insight and sympathy for their feelings by cooperating with them in organizing and participating in a variety of memorial services. Restrictive rules on open-air meetings were relaxed, classes in some places were excused, flags were lowered to half staff, and prominent blacks were invited to speak at memorial services. A near riot in the cafeteria of Pasadena City College was averted when the president diverted students who insisted on free lunches. Although he could not offer them free food, he invited them to be his guests. The contrast between the relative peace on junior college campuses and the widespread rioting and looting in many cities was noteworthy and a credit to the sensitivity of administrators at that time.

Of seventy-one school disorders reported by the Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence, not one involved a junior college. High schools, predominantly black colleges and universities, and white or integrated colleges and universities were the scenes of "reportable" incidents of violence. This phenomenon cannot be explained simply by the fact that the number of junior colleges is smaller than either of the other categories.**

Violence on a modest scale occurs on junior college campuses, but so far it has not reached the proportions it has on other campuses—even that on high school campuses. Much of the violence has been against property rather than persons. Some of it has been instigated by students opposed to a particular activist group, such as an incident at Los Angeles City College where student observers, incensed at the display of a Red flag instead of an American flag, attacked a speaker and his followers. At the College of Marin, members of the black students group broke up a dance, using "several karate-clad nonstudents" to intimidate the whites (60:6). A similar incident occurred at Mt. San Antonio College in California where the black students "broke up an Associated Students noon dance in an effort to make white students on campus aware of some of the problems that existed."*

---

* *School Management.* 12: 30; January 1968. Quoting Francis Ianni's talk at Teachers College, Columbia.

**"April Aftermath of the King Assassination." *Riot Data Review,* Number 2. August 1968. Riot Data Clearing House, Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts.

Egg and tomato throwing, catcalling, and name calling are common forms of violence. On one occasion at Los Angeles Valley College, students threw flares to disrupt an outdoor military recruiting station. It is difficult to prove whether or not an act of vandalism (such as that at Los Angeles Valley College one weekend, when two rooms were gutted by Molotovs, or that at San Jose City College, when a temporary classroom building burned), is attributable to activism. Some acts are, of course, but too many have been traced to children and noncampus adults (or occurred before activism was a prominent feature of college life) to warrant the assumption that all of them are.

A symbolical form of violence is practiced by Mexican-American groups, who attend Board of Education meetings in protest against alleged grievances. Members dress in semimilitary outfits and carry bullets, which they leave on their seats at the close of the meeting. At one meeting in Los Angeles, some members threw handfuls of shells toward the dais where the board members were seated.

Violence on junior college campuses will probably continue to be mild, although troublesome, and conditions in the community will influence its virulence. It is unlikely that junior college campuses will be untouched by so pervasive a culture pattern as violence.

---

* Dale Collins, Acting Dean of Men to author, September 23, 1968.

STUDENT-FACULTY-ADMINISTRATOR INTERACTIONS

chapter 6

STUDENT-FACULTY VS. ADMINISTRATION

Student power advocates usually associate themselves with faculty against administration, some even calling the present campus activity "student-faculty power." "The classic definition of student-faculty power rests on the presumption that the administration exists to administer—to make tactical decisions and strategic recommendations, based upon major policy decisions established by students and faculty acting jointly" (81:12). This appears to be a natural alliance, since both groups favor many of the same issues and seek freedom from administrative rules and regulations. Both attack the "Establishment," a vague term but one with emotional connotations to students and faculty who chafe at any restriction on their activities (59).

Carl Davidson, the S.D.S. strategist, recognizing this community of interest, suggested that S.D.S. "encourage the potentially radical sectors of the faculty to organize among themselves around their own grievances, hopefully being able to eventually form a radical alliance with them."*

Pressure is also exerted on faculty to support students. James D. Broman, the executive director of the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges, in his description of an incident in which Black Power students and faculty supporters packed the association's meeting in Chicago and took over the student division, observed that "when choices must be made in open meetings where faculty and students are together, faculty tend to side with students." He was told by several faculty members "that they dare not stand up against militants at these (state association) meetings because it would be miserable for them when they return to their individual campuses."**

---

* Quotation from Carl Davidson, *op. cit., College and University Business* 45:53; August 1968.

** Letter to author, September 25, 1968.

FACULTY SUPPORT: DISCRIMINATING

Faculty members have been and continue to be discriminating in their support of student causes. Many vocal members of the faculty support students in their struggles for free speech, freedom from censorship of their publication, and experimental colleges. They participate in their sit-ins, marches, and demonstrations. Except when students commit excesses, faculty favor amnesty for arrested students or minor penalties in disciplinary actions.

Fewer, but still many, faculty members will be sympathetic to student concerns over Vietnam, the draft, R.O.T.C., military and civilian recruiting on campus, defense research contracts, and the C.I.A. Less enthusiastic is faculty support of student concerns over admission standards and employment of minority members on a quota formula. When students attack or interfere with what goes on within the classroom, they encounter faculty resistance and a cooling of ardor for their cause. When black students demand the appointment of black instructors and administrators, when black, white, or brown students want a review of grading practices, student evaluation of instruction, the right to hire and fire instructors, or a revision of the curriculum, faculty then become part of that bugbear, the Establishment, against the rights of students.

Faculty opposition to students also appears when campus demonstrations and activities make it impossible to conduct classes because of excessive noise or blocking of entrances to classroom buildings.

When the Black Students Union at Los Angeles City College presented demands for the removal of two white instructors from classes on Negro history and for investigation of instructors discriminating against black students who spoke up for their rights and point of view, the district senate asked the faculty senates of the seven colleges to look into the matter with a view to protecting faculty against such demands.

The essential conflict between students and instructors is not yet clear-cut, but is becoming so. Changing the curriculum is one of the aims of activists; but, because of faculty resistance, very little progress has been or will be made. If activists should persist in their efforts to change the curriculum, they will find themselves in conflict with the faculty. Professor Bernard Bellush of City College (New York) remarked:

> There's been no radical revision of the curriculum in forty or fifty years. The departments ought to agree to greater development of interdisciplinary courses. But before any department gives up any course you have virtually a civil war in the curriculum committee (70:5).

White student activists on junior college campuses have not been as militant as blacks or Mexican-Americans in demanding curriculum changes or replacement of instructors. Some agitate for reforms of grading practices, student evaluation of instructors, or representation on faculty senates, but without much impact. Other issues, such as free speech, censorship bans on student publications, and off-campus speakers have been more vital to the activists. These issues usually involve administrators and occasionally individual instructors serving on student-faculty-administration committees. In general, despite predictions of more student dissent from faculty, on junior college campuses this dissent will more likely continue to come from minority groups, particularly blacks, rather than from whites.*

PATTERN OF STUDENT ACTIVISM

Sometimes students and faculty combine to espouse a community cause. In 1968, at the request of the students and faculty, the Board of Trustees of the Peralta, California, Junior College District appointed a committee of representatives of students, faculty, and administrators to draft an Equal Employment Opportunity Program for Construction Contracts, which the Board adopted with amendments. In the policy the Board announced:

> The Peralta Colleges construction program will be a union job. Although the Board recognizes that it cannot legally coerce a contractor into breaching existing agreements between the contractor and the unions, it is the hope . . . that union membership and contractors will cooperate fully with the Peralta District in making an all-out effort to provide job opportunities in the East Bay area (87).

At times students will side with the administrator if the adversary is the board of trustees. In 1967, at Macomb County Community College in Michigan, students petitioned the board to retain the president and had to be restrained by him from taking more militant action.

In most campus incidents, faculty, when involved, are in a supportive role; occasionally, however, students support faculty, as in two cases at the College of Marin near San Francisco. In 1966, in their newspaper and before meetings of the board, students criticized the board for turning down a faculty proposal for a higher salary schedule. About a year later, the students, in a dispute between the faculty and the superintendent and board over lines of communication, held rallies in front of the superintendent's office protesting his refusal to grant concessions to the faculty (60). Students have also supported faculty during strikes and work stoppages.

Students show a consistency in their actions even though their allegiance swings from support to opposition. In the illustrations above, students sided with the individual or group threatened by higher authority—the Establishment. They supported the "underdog." Although not germane to student-faculty-administration relations, student attitude is indicated by their support of cafeteria workers, custodians, and other non-academic employees in disputes with administrators over wages.

---

* Richard Martin. "Student Dissent Moves to a New Target." *Wall Street Journal.* August 28, 1968. This article is more pertinent to four-year colleges and universities than to junior colleges.

COMMUNITY OF INTEREST

Paradoxical as it may seem, students and faculty have individually as much in common with administrators as they have with each other. The emphasis on student activism and faculty-administrator conflict tends to obscure the many areas in which administrators act on behalf of students and faculty. Unfortunately, the administrator is in the middle in situations where he is the advocate of students against faculty and of the faculty against students, community leaders, or board members.

When a student has a grievance against a faculty member that cannot be adjusted between the two, the student's recourse is to get other students to take up his case or to appeal to an administrator. The latter gets the great majority of student grievances, which are exceptionally difficult to adjust because of the pressures on the administrator to support the faculty member and the many traditions, customs, and laws that make the classroom a privileged domain of the instructor, giving him the right to drop a student from his class, entrusting to him the form and content of his teaching, and empowering him to evaluate the student. In some states, a grade cannot be changed without the concurrence of the instructor. In education, the instructor is a divine-right king.

In spite of these formidable difficulties, an administrator can succeed in helping students, usually by reasoning privately with the instructor on the merits of the student's grievance, or by getting the instructor to permit the student to transfer to another class, or to review the basis on which a grade was determined. Wherever possible, the intelligent administrator gives the instructor the opportunity to make the adjustment with the student.

Someone has said administrators spend more time placating faculty than any other single group. Maintaining high faculty morale ranks as one of the two or three most important functions of administrators. They recognize that the excellence of the educational program rests upon the instructors' performance in the classroom, that they must depend upon them for implementing many of the programs they feel are important for the development of the institution, and that much of the student activism stems from the deterioration of the faculty-student relationship. Administrators also try to avoid or reduce faculty militancy by offering or acceding to demands for more faculty participation in the governance of the colleges.

Despite these efforts, only recently have administrators been accorded any support (for different reasons, of course) from students and faculty. Faculty are more inclined to support administrators than students because more often student actions are directed against or adversely affect faculty as well as administrators.

For a time, administrators were made to feel so guilt-ridden that some of them developed rationales containing an unusual amount of self-depreciation, including hypocrisy, immorality, etc. They anointed students with all the virtues, considering them blessed almost from birth with perspicacity to understand their elder's deficient morality and with innate ability to overcome the blight of original sin.* This guilt complex, fostered by the many apologists for student activism, may be summed up in Alfred Kazin's statement:

> Only youth is poor enough and 'irresponsible' enough to look life straight in the face and to see the anxiety and bad conscience that weigh down so many 'successes' in our society (40:123).

The lot of the administrators could not be otherwise, given the trend against authoritarianism and the revolt against those in power. Administrators on campus either established or enforced the rules and regulations that were so irksome to students and faculty. Also, many administrators were no more sensitive to the mood and needs of students and faculty than the community has been to those of its youths and minorities. Moreover, administrators either did not see the justice of the demands made upon them to relax the rules or else resented the attacks on their prerogatives and the imputation that they were dictatorial. Probably some were aggrieved by so much opposition to their benevolent paternalism. They justified much of their inaction by the cliché that evolution, not revolution, is the American way.

REACTION TO STUDENT EXCESSES

Because of the excesses of activists against speakers, college personnel, placement and military recruiters, and "campus time, place, and manner rules," administrators are losing their patience and taking a firmer position in dealing with students. Increasing professional, community, and political pressures for greater control of student activists have helped administrators to stiffen their backs.

Individual faculty members and faculty senates, with or without administrative collaboration, are now issuing statements decrying student disruptive tactics and warning students of possible disciplinary actions. The National Council of the American Association of University Professors expressed its conviction

> . . . that action by individuals or groups to prevent speakers invited to the campus from speaking, to disrupt the operations of the institutions in the course of demonstrations or to obstruct and restrain other members of the academic community and campus visitors by physical force is destructive of the pursuit of learning and of a free society.**

---

* *Antioch Notes.* April, 1968 reproduced by Los Angeles Harbor College, May 23, 1968, and W. H. Ferry, "Forward" in *Students and Society. Report on a Conference.* p. 1-2. Santa Barbara, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, December, 1967.

** From *Resolution as Amended and Adopted by the Los Angeles Division of the Academic Senate* (University of California) *on November 21, 1967.* Mimeo.

"In the light of recent occurrences" the National Council of the American Civil Liberties Union also considered

> . . . it important to emphasize that it does not approve of demonstrators who deprive others of the opportunity to speak or be heard, or physically obstruct movement or otherwise disrupt legitimate educational or institutional processes in a way that interferes with the freedom of others."*

The president of Mt. San Antonio College issued a statement, "Freedom and Responsibility Inherent in Protests," in which he endorsed the "free expression of ideas and a guaranteed freedom of movement for individuals [as] essential to public educational institutions." At the same time, he made it clear that obstruction or interference with the freedom of others would not be tolerated "no matter what number of students may be involved or tend to become committed, nor in consideration of what morality is involved in support of any such participation."** The California College and University Faculty Association went on record as "unequivocally opposed to recent actions of violent and otherwise disorderly nature precipitated by a small minority of dissidents on California State College campuses," because these actions "constitute dangerous assaults on the principles of a free society, such as freedom of speech and assembly" (8:1).

Editorials deplore "the kind of 'unrest' that has been flowering among certain of our student groups," castigate the administrator who, "like Chancellor Heyns, has sometimes seemed to resemble the permissive parent who ignores his unruly kids as they pester others," and applaud the administrator who "can be firm." Student activists are "preachers of tolerance when their own concerns are on the block but activists for intolerance when others are involved, 'seeing' virtue in dissent only if dissent is theirs."†

Even Norman Thomas, a strong dissenter against American policy in Vietnam, recoiled "at seeing young dissenters burn the flag of my country, the country I love."‡

Congress and state legislatures are making clear their opposition to student excesses by legislation, resolutions, and statements of their members. On November 8, 1967, Congress included in an appropriation measure an amendment prohibiting use of funds "to provide payment, assistance, or services . . . to any individual convicted . . . of inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot, or any group activity resulting in material damage to property or injury to persons, found to be in violation of federal, state or local laws designed to protect persons or property in the community concerned."* Almost a year later, Representative William J. Scherle, a Republican from Iowa, expressed the sentiments of a large majority in the House when he argued in behalf of a similar amendment to an omnibus bill extending authorizations under four higher education laws:

---

* *Ibid.;* See also, Chancellor Heyns to Faculty: "Urge Students To Put Reason over Passion." *University Bulletin* 16:1; November 13, 1967 and "Statement of Franklin D. Murphy to the U.C.L.A. Community." November 9, 1967. Mimeo.

** Mt. San Antonio College (California) "Freedom and Responsibility Inherent in Protests." In: Richard A. Lowe, "A Study of Student Activism and an Assessment of the Implications to Community Colleges." Term Paper, Education 470C, University of California, (Los Angeles), 1968.

† Quotations taken from column "Comment" in *University* (of California) *Bulletin,* January 8, 1968 and November 27, 1967 from the Sacramento *Union,* Hayward *Review,* and the San Francisco *Examiner.*

‡ *University* (of California) *Bulletin,* November 29, 1967, quoting the New York *Times.*

> The taxpayers of this country have paid a great deal of money to educate youngsters, and I do not see why they should be asked to continue to pay for the frivolity and the riots and the demonstrations that we have had running rampant throughout this country (19:2025).

Scherle's amendment passed by a 260 to 146 roll-call vote.

In 1968 the Ohio General Assembly enacted legislation requiring all colleges receiving state funds to adopt rules for the conduct of students, faculty, administrative staff, nonacademic employees, and visitors. A California legislative resolution, if passed, would have forced campus administrators "to expel any students or faculty member who took part in disturbances or otherwise broke the rules of their institutions."** California State Senator Cusanovitch concluded one of his weekly columns with a statement reflecting the impatience of a growing segment of the public with student "acts of rebellion against law and disregard of university and college rules and regulations." (See page 57 for discussion of reaction to violence.)

PROBABLE CONSEQUENCES

This reaction, from so many sources, may lead to repressive action against activists. Some even fear the emergence of a second McCarthy era of intimidation of all liberal thought and action. The widespread disaffection among police, the strong conservative trend in the elections of the last two years, the increasingly tough stand of administrators, and the punitive legislative enactments point in that direction. The criticism and censure by legislative resolution of University of California regents and administrators for permitting the appointment of Black Panther leader Eldridge Cleaver as a guest lecturer in an experimental class on racism at Berkeley attests to the strength of this reaction. Opposition by the Speaker of the Assembly, Jesse M. Unruh, to "this silly little resolution" failed to remove the regents, the chancellor, or the president from the resolution.*

---

* (Sec. 907, P.L. 90-132).

** Senator Lou Cusanovitch (California) *Your Legislator at Work: A Weekly Column,* June 6, 1968.

Up through the close of the 1968 academic year, however, activism on college campuses was as rampant as at any time since F.S.M. Moreover, student activism has elements that make it improbable that it will end soon. The ethnic character of Black Power and, to a lesser extent, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American Power, transcends the campus. Adjusting to the demands or aspirations of these students will involve a revolutionary change in the organization and the educational program of the colleges, a change that will be resisted by old-guard authorities despite all the talk about the need for it.

---

* *Los Angeles Times,* September 20 and 21, 1968. See also: Meg Greenfield, "In 1968, Read 'Crime' for 'Communism': Law and Order Stirs Memories of Fifties." (*Los Angeles Times,* Sec. G., August 25, 1968. p. 3).

ASSESSMENT

chapter 7

The aim of student activism or the "student power" movement is designed to "gain students their full rights to democratically control their nonacademic lives and participate to the fullest in the administrative and educational decision-making process of the college."* The activism of the 1960's has brought about a remarkable change in the position of students on junior college campuses. Much of the change was accomplished by direct action of students, some as a result of changes in the mores of our society, and some by the changed attitude of college and university administrators. The courts and, to a lesser degree, the state legislatures contributed to the gains made by students. The regressive legislation and restraining court decisions, while serious, have not adversely affected the students' freedom; in most instances, they have attempted to curb only the excesses of student activists.

EFFECT ON CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

In many areas, the effects of student activism on the curriculum are of a transitory nature. Experimental colleges conducted by students are usually short-lived, as were teach-ins, and, except for some odd titles and course contents, are not significant. Their contribution to reform has been to point up the dissatisfaction of some students and faculty with the traditional curriculum and instructional methods. Changes that appear to be more permanent include courses and curriculums on Afro-American history, culture, literature, art, music, and language. Agitation for these changes is not limited to college curriculums; it affects all areas of society. It is too early to judge whether or not the separatist trend toward having black instructors teach black courses to black students will become established practice on junior college campuses. Some administrators are making concessions in this direction; but it is probable that blacks may, after gaining recognition of their demands, recede from their extreme position. The reorientation of the curriculum toward a world view rather than the exclusive Western view may be a permanent contribution of student activism to the junior colleges.

---

* *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 1:7; August 23, 1967, quoting from statement of the National Students Association.

Very little has been accomplished in changing the quality of instruction. Occasional flurries appear on campuses for evaluation of instructors. Student evaluations are made, sometimes published, but more often given to the instructor for whatever use he wishes to make of them. An exception is "Insight: A View of the Faculty Through the Eyes of Their Students,"* which contains the results of a student-faculty evaluation project at Palomar College. Included in the widely distributed booklet are some frank, critical student evaluations of faculty. The revival of student evaluations is a tribute to the persuasiveness of the students, since the Palomar faculty, like most faculties, "took great exception to the practice" when it was required by the governing board and did not follow its mandate.

Even when published, these student evaluations have little effect on the instructors' teaching. Follow-ups to determine their effectiveness on instruction are seldom made. Administrative evaluations have been no more effective. Faculty in junior colleges believe classroom evaluations by administrators are a carry-over from the high school, although they do not make the parallel observation that student evaluations are a university practice (7:6) (13).

CHARTERS OF LIBERTY

The three statements on governance and student rights (see page 34) are documents of far-reaching importance because in them are incorporated the essence of the rights for which students have agitated. Long after student activism becomes history, these documents will influence administrators in defining the rights and responsibilities of students. These documents, together with court cases, form a *magna carta* for students.

The documents, however, are not self-implementing. They require transformation into the rules and regulations of the colleges. Translating the various sections will require considerable educational statesmanship even among those already committed to the principles enunciated in the documents. For those educators who subscribe to the letter but not to the spirit of the principle, the general and vague nature of some sections offers them opportunities to resist granting real freedom and self-government to the students.

Many more court cases will arise because students are insisting on rights formerly unheard of. These will help set the guidelines and the limits, and the particular responsibilities and authority of each group.

---

* San Marcos, California, Palomar College Press, Spring 1968.

STUDENT EMANCIPATION

Students are much freer on campus and their off-campus activities are of practically no official concern to college authorities. Some freedoms, such as smoking and card playing, antedated the activist movement, being won by returning veterans of World War II in 1947 and 1948. Prohibitions on junior college campuses on these activities were vestiges of the former status of the junior college as part of the high school.

Dress regulations were usually less strict in junior colleges than in high schools, but more stringent than on university campuses. During this period, however, they have become more liberal, until today on many campuses almost any kind of dress is permitted. Shorts, slacks, beards, and long hair for men and shorts, sandals, miniskirts, and stretch pants for women are common attire. A few colleges attempt to curb students who go barefooted. Some faculty, especially those in occupational areas, are more conservative than administrators and require students to conform to rules they claim are current in the business and industry groups they serve.

Restrictions on student newspapers and publications are loosening.* Few have gone as far as Peralta (California) Junior College District's policy of no censorship of any student publication in any of its colleges or the policy of Pine Manor Junior College (Massachusetts), which permits students to publish a newspaper *Salmagundi* without faculty supervision or censorship. Only a few retain the tight supervision so common before the 1960's. Between the two extremes, various accommodations to freedom of the press have been made. Four-letter words, nudes, and phallic symbols appear in many campus publications. Captions on articles that were unthinkable a decade ago are commonplace today. "Is the preservation of virginity more important than the preservation of life itself?" causes hardly an eyebrow to flutter (34:10).

Legal problems still arise for administrators who want to give students freedom from faculty or administrative supervision. The printer of El Camino's (California) *Life Warrior*, refused to include a nude picture of a small child unless he received from the college a "hold harmless" waiver of responsibility and liability. He contended that the child could sue the printer many years later for causing him pain and anguish because of the picture. College governing boards in most states cannot absolve themselves of liability for acts committed by students engaged in college activities. Before complete freedom can be granted, some way must be found to free colleges from libel and damage suits resulting from student actions.

Free speech in its various forms appears to be less of a problem on junior college campuses. Students are given more freedom to discuss subjects of their own choosing, either indoors or outdoors. Off-campus speakers of nearly all persuasions from the extreme right to the extreme left are appearing with increasing frequency. Boards of trustees are less uneasy about the ideology of speakers and more willing to support administrators' judgment in this area. Some boards have endorsed the A.A.U.P. statement or have adopted similar ones subscribing to the principle of free speech.* Today, conservatives are complaining that colleges have "a steady stream of left-wing speakers."** Administrators in many colleges are still reluctant or unwilling to approve Communist or extreme leftist speakers. A few apply the same restrictive policy to extreme rightist speakers. Some are also uneasy about permitting Black Power advocates, because of community objections to speakers like Dick Gregory or Black Panther leader, Eldridge Cleaver, who antagonize people in such greatly different communities as those served by Los Angeles Harbor College and Colby Junior College, a women's private junior college in New London, New Hampshire. Black Power militants are more feared than Communists.

---

* "How To Organize Control of Your Student Publications." *College and University Business*, 43: 4-10; October 1967, has some useful suggestions.

To keep some control over the selection of speakers, administrators are appointing student-faculty-administration committees to formulate speakers' policies. In California these policies, which are influenced by the university's policy,† include statements on the relevance of the speaker's topic and on his willingness to answer "unselected questions from the floor which are related to his address."‡ On-campus approval is usually required from a dean or the president.

College administrators, on their own and at the urging of students, faculty, and community leaders, are reexamining the position of the student in the governance of the college, with special attention to his rights, privileges, and responsibilities. Through student-faculty-administration committees, they are preparing and adopting standards for student conduct. Within limits they are permitting students to determine the kind of government they desire.

These may not seem like significant concessions to students, but in comparison with conditions before the advent of activism, they are far-reaching. Just to admit that students have rights, that speakers' policies should be formulated with students, that procedures for disciplinary actions must be written, that curriculum changes are needed, that instruction needs to be improved, that more black and brown instructors and administrators should be appointed constitutes a tremendous victory.

---

* Board of Trustees, San Mateo (California) Junior College District. "Board of Trustees' Policy on the Study of Controversial Issues." Adopted September 14, 1960; Revised August 9, 1967; Policies and Procedures Section 6.35.

** Fremont, California *Argus*, April 4, 1968, quoting a board member.

† *Regulations on the Use of U.C.L.A. Facilities by Students and Registered Student Organizations.* "V. Meetings Involving Off-Campus Speakers." p. 8-10. July 1, 1966. Mimeo.

‡ Fremont, California *Argus*, April 4, 1968, quoting from proposed policy for Ohlone College.

AREAS OF FUTURE CONCERN

Although predictions are difficult, some possible areas of future student concern are discernible. Any one of the areas to be described may make the junior college campus the focus of the next wave of student activism. Areas involving minority students are more likely to be troublesome than those involving white students. Unless students from the higher socioeconomic strata increase proportionately, white students can be expected to be less active than those on four-year and university campuses for the reasons cited on page 6. As will be mentioned shortly, the present enrollment trend will continue with a likelihood of acceleration in the same direction. Proportionately more, rather than fewer, students will come from the lower socioeconomic strata and from minority groups.

BACKLASH

S.D.S., Black Power, and Mexican-American Power advocates may become more active on junior college campuses. However, if the Vietnam conflict ends and if the draft regulations are relaxed as a result, it is likely that white, leftist activists may become less potent in the student activist movement. The New Left may be adversely affected by the backlash or reaction that seems to be forming in the nation. Jefferson Clubs, Young Americans for Freedom, and others with anti-left orientations may become more active on college campuses, creating clashes with S.D.S. and other leftist groups.* In the suburban junior colleges and in those in the cities with predominantly white student bodies, the high incidence of drug-use adds to the difficulties of dealing with student activism.

An irrational and undiscriminating reaction to student activism is an ever-present danger. The cry now being heard and heeded is for law and order—the principal issue of the 1968 presidential campaign. Many are wondering if the alliance of Southern Democrats and Northern Republicans presages a neowhite supremacy rule comparable to that following the 1876 election, recognizing that a difference exists. The difference is that the 1968 alliance affects the North as much as or more than the South, and the whites will have to deal with a better-organized and less docile black population. The alliance will have reverberations on the college campus, the focal point for change. Campus administrators who are political conservatives may take advantage of this opportunity to reassert their authority. Their actions may engender campus turmoil if no distinction is made, or only lip service is paid to the difference "between the many students who are demonstrating for increased participation in the decisions that affect their lives, and the few students who are exploiting this underlying situation for their own avowed destructive ends" (22:16).

---

* At U.C.L.A., S.D.S. was suspended in July 1968 because its members tore down posters of Viet Cong atrocities displayed by the Jefferson Club. At Macomb County Community College South Campus in Michigan, the Fall 1968 Student Senate approved chartering an S.D.S. Club only after a close 9-7 vote.

Nonblack Minorities: In a few colleges with large numbers of students of Mexican-American heritage, pressures may increase for concessions similar to those acquired by the blacks. The Mexican-American students, according to some militants, will "seek to preserve their heritage and to develop and strengthen it within themselves, in order not only to build an identity and to gain a measure of self-respect, but also to protect their community from the dangers of assimilation" (73:11). The Puerto Ricans in New York are developing a militancy approaching that of the blacks, with whom they are allied against the whites, in the squabble over control of the public schools.

Black Power: The most difficult group to satisfy will be the blacks in the urban colleges. Many areas of concern are building up, prompted by campus conditions and abetted by off-campus militant groups. "Some observers feel many black views have become so desperate that they are thinking now not of how to use their lives but of how to use their deaths in violent, valiant attacks on white society" (21).

The black student movement will continue to be supported by community groups, of which the Black Panthers are the most revolutionary and violent. The conditions that made the Black Power movement possible are not disappearing. Moreover, it can be expected that, as blacks gain concessions and as leaders emerge in positions of power, the movement will gain momentum and the demands on college administrators will become more insistent. "They have seen a bit of progress, and now they want much more, enough to gain what the rest of us don't think or talk about but simply have: social and economic power" (14:38).

On campuses, four large areas of possible conflict are discernible:

1. *De facto* segregation of students
2. Racial composition of college employees
3. Dissatisfaction with policies relating to intercollegiate athletics, theatre arts, broadcasting, journalism, music, and apprenticeship courses
4. Inadequate educational programs for minorities.

1. De Facto Segregation of Students

If the number of junior colleges continues to increase and if some are placed in or near concentrations of nonwhite population centers, *de facto* segregated colleges will result. As mentioned above, some colleges have reached that stage. Today, junior colleges in the Far West enroll more than 71 per cent of all Negro students (41:7). Inner-city junior colleges may become the Negro colleges of the North. Efforts being made to avoid segregation have not been too successful. In multicollege districts, administrators are trying to keep the colleges integrated by (1) providing open enrollment enabling students to attend any college in the district; (2) establishing unique programs in the different colleges thereby requiring students to attend colleges *not* near their homes; (3) encouraging foreign and out-of-state students to attend; and (4) developing and maintaining a tradition of excellence in both extracurricular and instructional programs.

If the present trend of enrollment continues, however, it is unlikely that junior college educators will have any more success in maintaining integrated colleges than the elementary and secondary school educators. If this be true, it is reasonable to predict that, in *de facto* segregated junior colleges, Black Power activists will demand more control and self-determination in the administration and operation of the institutions.

2. Racial Composition of College Employees

Junior colleges are vulnerable to the charge of neocolonialism, i.e., that whites hold the positions of power, influence, and prestige, while blacks hold the menial or less influential positions. The few blacks who hold positions of power, influence, and prestige are considered tokens to the concept of equal opportunity employment practice. On the academic staffs, the colleges, while not as lily-white as formerly, are still predominantly so. The proportion of black instructors is low and the proportion of black administrators is lower. California has one black junior college president and a few second-echelon administrators in its eighty-two junior colleges. At the last meeting of the Junior College Advisory Panel to the State Board of Education in 1968, Ples Griffin of the Office of Compensatory Education stated that "not one minority group person had been reported as holding the post of superintendent, director, consultant, or counselor in any California Junior College District Office" (55).

In one large district, out of approximately seventy-first and second-echelon administrators in the colleges, only one is black. Less than 3 per cent of the instructors are black. Among nonacademic employees, the situation is more satisfactory in the inner-city junior colleges. Blacks comprise a large percentage of the staffs from the lowest (custodial, clerks) to the more highly paid (stenographers, supervisors, secretaries), but they hold very few executive-type nonacademic positions, either in the colleges or in the central office.

In both the academic and nonacademic areas, administrators in urban colleges and, to a lesser extent, in suburban colleges, are increasing the proportion of black employees. Pressures from the blacks and from board members are breaking down the barriers, but progress is slow. Those in control contend they would employ more blacks (and those from other minorities) if they were "qualified." In the Los Angeles system, this means passing a civil service examination. In New York the charge has been made that "ethnic" politics plays a prominent part in preventing blacks and Puerto Ricans from advancing. A member of the New York City Board of Examiners is reported as saying, "Forty years ago, you had to be Irish to pass. Over the past generation, it helped a lot to be Jewish. I would not deny that some unconscious discrimination existed" (72:60). Similar situations exist elsewhere, but, as in New York today, more blacks are being employed and a few are making it to the top.

3. Dissatisfaction with Policies in Participatory Programs

Continued difficulty will also be encountered in those areas where participation of students is involved and in apprenticeship programs. The most publicized is intercollegiate athletics. Here is another instance in which junior college administrators have fared better than their four-year college colleagues. How much dissatisfaction exists among black junior college athletes is not known, but it certainly exists. Junior college coaches until recently were almost exclusively white and they harbored the same prejudices as other whites. Until recently, perhaps a decade ago, subtle forms of discrimination were practiced or condoned. Moreover, white physical education instructors have resisted the assignment of blacks to their staffs on the ground that using the same dressing rooms and shower facilities was offensive to them. Black junior college athletes express their resentments in subtle ways, usually by not cooperating with the white team members. Often, as a result, morale is low and the team fails to function efficiently. With the appointment of black instructors, the situation is improving, but the continued contrast in urban junior colleges between predominantly black teams and almost lily-white athletic coaching staffs could provoke revolt or boycott.

Closely parallel discriminatory conditions in journalism, theatre arts, broadcasting, and music departments have been cited by black students. In each of these areas student participation is important to the instructional program. As in athletics, the faculties are white, but, in contrast to athletics, the students are also predominantly white, except in music, where many blacks are in the band, orchestra, and especially choral organizations. Black students charge that, through auditions and other performance tests, white instructors exclude them from classes and especially from the group activities. At Los Angeles City College, black students have agitated against alleged discriminatory practices in journalism, theatre arts, and broadcasting. The journalism incident is described on page 28. At San Jose's City College, black militants disrupted classes in apprenticeship training because of their all-white enrollment. In Los Angeles, representatives of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People have filed an injunction suit against the board to prevent it from offering apprenticeship courses that are not integrated. In these complaints, the blacks maintain that through tests and interviews they are excluded from most of the programs. Less than five years ago, it was almost impossible for a black to gain admission to an apprenticeship program in California. No blacks were in ironworking, boilermaking, and telephone installation programs. In Sacramento they represented ".5 per cent of the total in the programs; in Bakersfield 0.0 per cent; in San Bernardino .4 per cent, and in Orange County .3 per cent" (20:101). Blacks did better in Los Angeles in roofing, with 6.48 per cent; auto-repairing, 4.28 per cent; bricklaying, 3.24 per cent; and carpentry, 2.92 per cent. The situation is only slightly better today.

4. Inadequate Educational Programs for Minorities

A problem of equal importance derives from the inability of the junior colleges to develop instructional programs to help blacks overcome handicaps of birth, culture, previous education, and aptitude. According to a recent report of conditions in California, this is a "task of unbelievable magnitude."*

Probably in no area of junior college education is there more concern. Translating this concern into activity has been a discouraging process for administrators and the small number of faculty interested in the problem. No one seems to know how and what to teach students who rank in the lowest 15 per cent as measured by college aptitude tests. Added to this ignorance is the resistance of the majority of faculty to working with low-ability students and their insistence on maintaining collegiate standards. As long as emphasis in the instructional program remains on verbal ability, and if it be true that there is no method "by which a twelfth graders' verbal ability can be improved by any planned program," the problem becomes almost insoluble (41:10). (See also Ernest H. Berg and Dayton Axtell, "Programs for Disadvantaged in the California Community College." Oakland. Peralta Junior College District, 1968. The Junior College Advisory Panel contracted with the district to conduct the study.)

Unless something is done, junior colleges may become as involved in problems of control and operation as are the public schools of the large cities. Today, black activists demand "a Black Studies Curriculum which places the Black man in proper perspective in past and contemporary history. Tomorrow, the emphasis will be on a Black Studies Curriculum which responds to the needs of the students."**

In this summary, stress has been placed on the black students because they are currently the group in the junior colleges most likely to explode. They have serious grievances, some of which stem from off-campus conditions and others, from on campus. The interrelationships between the two are closer than those of other activist groups. In "A Study of Ghetto Rioters," Caplan and Paige considered white discrimination an almost insuperable barrier for blacks. They concluded that:

> The continued exclusion of Negroes from American economic and social life is the fundamental cause of riots. This exclusion is the result of arbitrary racial barriers rather than of lack of ability, motivation or aspiration on the part of Negroes, and it is most galling to young Negroes who perceive it as arbitary and unjust (9:15-21).

In addition to reviewing the highlights of this decade's student activism, this concluding chapter has enumerated certain pressure points affecting

---

* *Los Angeles Sentinel,* June 27, 1968, reporting on statement made by Ernest H. Berg to the Junior College Advisory Council to the State Board of Education.

** Position Paper of the Black Student Body on the Educational Responsibilities of Cuyahoga (Cleveland) Community College, May 1968, presented to the vice-President and Metropolitan Campus Director.

EDUCATION A CAUSE FOR FUTURE ACTIVISM

primarily black minority students. Much of what has been said about blacks applies to other minorities, but to a more limited extent. The future wave of student activism will include Black Power or some similar movement. The new movement may even encompass a broader spectrum of students because of the importance of education in modern society.

It is a truism to state that education has a tremendous effect on the socioeconomic structure of society and on the status of the individual. Contrary to popular impression, education widens the gap between the classes. Education has been the means of upward mobility for many, although its effect has been exaggerated. The almost frantic efforts of minorities to overcome the handicaps of educational impoverishment come from a realization of the importance of education for success. Even though, for many of them, education does not give parity with whites, it does enable them to rise to an upper stratum in the structure (20:100).

The apparent contradiction between the effect on an educated person in the upward mobility process and the assertion that education widens the gap disappears when it becomes clear that education is so essential to success or upward mobility that those who cannot qualify for admission to and graduation from college will be doomed to a form of proletarianism. The gap between low and high status is not as easily bridged today as it was in the early years of our history. Then the limited education of most people did not differentiate the successful from the unsuccessful as it does today. Then personal characteristics of intelligence, courage, daring, ruthlessness, cunning, and other traits had as much to do with success as education.

The present form of activism may have reached its peak during the spring of 1968. Students need time to consolidate their gains, administrators have learned from their mistakes and experiences, the public is weary and impatient with the students' unreasonableness. Much of the novelty, surprise, and suspense of the activism of the past four years has worn off. Disputes among leaders over strategy, withdrawal of those who succeed or get older, disenchantment with leaders, failure of leaders to keep in touch with changing conditions, disappearance of causes, and many other factors will contribute to the disintegration of the movement. The leaders of today's revolution will become the reactionaries of tomorrow's counter revolution. There is no more basis for assuming that the activism of the 1960's will be self-perpetuating than there was for assuming that the activism of the 1930's or of any other period would be so.

At what time or in what manner the next upsurge of students will come is just as difficult to predict as it is to pinpoint the time and manner of the demise of today's activism. But that another will come is a reasonable prediction based on previous actions of students. The history of higher education gives no assurance that student tranquility on college campuses lasts indefinitely.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *Berkeley California Monthly* 77: 10-11, March 1967.
2. Blackwell, Thomas E. "Court Affirms University's Right to Discipline Students." *College and University Business* 43: 15; September 1967.
3. ——. "Courts Tend to Declare Higher Education a Necessity of Life." *College and University Business* 46: 12; December 1967.
4. Borgese, Elizabeth Mann. "The Other Hill." *The Center Magazine* 1: 2-11; July 1968.
5. Brann, James W. "Embattled Stony Brook Defends Itself." *"The Chronicle of Higher Education* 2: 1; March 11, 1968.
6. "Stronger After CIA Scandal; NSA Pushes Student Power." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 2: 1; August 12, 1968.
7. "When Students Rate Professors and Their Courses." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 3: 6; September 2, 1968.
8. California Teachers Association. *The California Professor* 2: 1; January 1968.
9. Caplan, Nathan S., and Paige, Jeffrey M. "A Study of Ghetto Rioters." *Scientific American* 219: 15-21; August 1968.
10. Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. *Students and Society; Report on a Conference.* Occasional Paper no. 1. Santa Barbara, Calif.: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1967.
11. *Center Magazine,* June, 1968, p. 58.
12. *Chronicle of Higher Education.* "NSA Cuts CIA Ties. Finds Its Members Loyal." 1: 8-10; February 22, 1967. (Excerpts from an article "NSA-CIA" in March 1966 issue of *Ramparts* are reproduced on page 8.)
13. Cohen, Arthur M., and Brawer, Florence B. *Measuring Faculty Performance.* Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.
14. Coles, Robert. "The Rage Around Us." *New Republic* 159: 38; August 17, 1968.
15. *College and University Business.* "Student Bill of Rights." 43: 78; September 1967.
16. *College and University Business* 37: 9, August 1965.
17. *College and University Business* 43: 19; August 1967.
18. *College and University Business* 45: 46; August 1968.
19. *Congressional Quarterly.* August 2, 1968. p. 2,025. Reprint.
20. Conot, Robert. *Rivers of Blood, Years of Darkness.* New York: Bantam Books, 1967.
21. Cooper, Richard. *Los Angeles Times,* August 11, 1968.
22. Cousins, Norman. "The Crusade for Law and Order." *Saturday Review* 51: 16; July 6, 1968.
23. *Creative Notebook for College and University Presidents.* Amherst, New York: Research Series Inc., May 1968.

24. Cross, Patricia K. *The Junior College Student: A Research Description.* Princeton, New Jersey: Education Testing Service, 1968.
25. Davidson, Carl. *College and University Business* 45: 51-53; August 1968.
26. Dolci, Danilo. "Mafia-Client Politics." *Saturday Review* 51: 51; July 6, 1968.
27. Drummond, William J. "Anarchy of the 'Street People' Rises as Specter in Berkeley." *Los Angeles Times* Section A, September 8, 1968.
28. East Los Angeles College. *Campus News,* May 29, 1968.
29. Farrow, Donald B. "Influence of the Liberals." *Freshman Voices* (Edited by Colin B. Mathews.) Palo Alto, California: Stanford University, n. d. pp. 51-55.
30. Freeman, Castle W., Jr. "The Psychology of Revolt: How It Felt at Columbia." *College and University Business* 44: 56; June 1968.
31. Gardner, John. *Self-Renewal.* New York: Harper & Row, 1963.
32. Glazer, Nathan, and Moynihan, Daniel P. *Beyond the Melting Pot.* Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge, M.I.T., and Harvard University Press, 1964.
33. Halleck, S. L. "Stress and Student Unrest." Address presented to concurrent General Session I at the 23rd National Conference on Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, March 4, 1968. Mimeo.
34. Herron, Orley R. *Life Warrior* 6: 10; Spring 1968. (El Camino College, Calif.)
35. Hessen, Robert. "Campus or Battleground? Columbia Is a Warning to All American Universities." Reprint from *Barron's,* May 20, 1968.
36. Hook, Sidney. "Student Revolts Could Destroy Academic Freedom." *Freedom House Newsletter,* June 1968.
37. Horle, Reid F., and Thompson, John T. "Legal and Political Implications of Policies Governing Admission to Publicly Supported Institutions of Higher Education." *College and University* 43: 274-285; Spring 1968.
38. Howe, Harold. "Why We Need a Change in the Pecking Order." *College Board Review* 66: 30; Winter 1967-68.
39. Johnson, Alan W. "Double Jeopardy: A Misnomer." *Journal of Higher Education* 37: 17, 20; January 1966.
40. Kazin, Alfred. "The Young: The Party of Hope." *Vogue* 152: 123; August 1, 1968.
41. Kendrick, S. A. "The Coming of Segregation of Our Selective Colleges." *College Board Review* 66: 7-10; Winter 1967-68.
42. Kerner, Otto. *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.* New York: Bantam Books, 1968.
43. Kilson, Martin L., Jr. "Negro Separatism in the Colleges." *Harvard Today,* Spring 1968, p. 30.
44. Kinnison, William A. "New Power Relationships on the Campus." *Journal of Higher Education* 39: 309; June 1968.

45. Kirk, Grayson. "A Message to Alumni, Parents, and Other Friends of Columbia," New York: Columbia University, June 1, 1968.
46. Leon, John F.; Abderhalden, Jack W.; and McConaghy, Irving. *The East Los Angeles Community: A Report by the East Los Angeles Communications Task Force in School-Community Relations.* Los Angeles: Los Angeles City Schools, June 1968.
47. *Life.* 63: 22; August 23, 1968.
48. Lipset, Martin Seymour. "Students and Politics in Comparative Perspective." *Daedalus* 97: 3-5; Winter 1968.
49. Los Angeles City College. *Los Angeles Collegian.* January 12, 1968.
50. ——. *Los Angeles Collegian.* March 12, 1968.
51. ——. *Los Angeles Collegian.* May 23, 1968.
52. ——. *Los Angeles Collegian.* December 12, 1967.
53. Los Angeles Pierce College. *Pierce College Roundup,* March 31, 1967.
54. ——. *Pierce College Roundup.* April 5, 1968.
55. *Los Angeles Sentinel.* June 27, 1968.
56. *Los Angeles Times.* March 21, 1968.
57. *Los Angeles Times.* Part 1. June 12, 1968.
58. *Los Angeles Times.* Section B. July 21, 1968.
59. *Los Angeles Times.* "Six (Stanford) Professors Explain Reasons for Supporting Demonstration." Section C. June 23, 1968.
60. Lowe, Richard H. *A Study of Student Activism and an Assessment of the Implications to Community Colleges.* Term paper, Education 470C. Los Angeles; University of California, July 30, 1968. Typed.
61. Momboisse, Raymond M. "Tactics for Colleges Facing Student Demonstrations." *College and University Business* 44: 131; May 1968.
62. Nunez, Rene. *Annual Report, September 15, 1967 - June 30, 1968.* Los Angeles: Educational Clearinghouse for Central Los Angeles, 1968. Mimeo.
63. Ohlone College. *Fremont News Register.* April 22, 1968.
64. *Peralta Colleges Bulletin.* January 12, 1968.
65. Peterson, Richard E. "The Student Left in American Higher Education." *Daedalus* 97: 293-317; Winter 1968.
66. *Phi Delta Kappan.* 49: 161; November 1967.
67. Rader, Dotson. "More About Columbia." *New Republic* 158: 23; June 8, 1968.
68. Rawitch, Robert. "Merritt College's Negro Leader Faces Broad Racial Challenge." *Los Angeles Times.* Section C. September 8, 1968. p. 1
69. Redford, Edward H. "Profiting from Activism." *Junior College Journal* 38: 7-12; November 1967.
70. Reinert, Sue. "A Report on the Student Protests." *The New York City College Alumnus* 63: 5-8; March 1968.
71. Robinson, Marian. "Education in Lilliput." *Changing Education* 1: 39-43; Winter 1967.

72. Rogers, David. "New York City Schools: A Sick Bureaucracy." *Saturday Review* 51: 60; July 20, 1968.

73. Ruiz, Ramon Eduardo. "Another Defector from the Gringo World." *New Republic* 159: 11; July 27, 1968.

74. Schwartz, Edward. "Tactics for Handling Campus Disturbances." *College and University Business* 45: 55; August 1968.

75. Segure, Roger. "Address to the Los Angeles Board of Education." August 15, 1968. Mimeo.

76. Simmons, J. F., and Winograd, Barry. *it's happening*. Santa Barbara, Calif.: Marc-Laird Publications, 1966.

77. Simonsen, Edward. "The President and the Student." Address presented at the National Conference on the Junior College President. University of California, Los Angeles, July 15-17, 1968. Los Angeles: University of California, 1968.

78. Suarez, Joe. "Junior Colleges Not Places to Breed Participation." *Los Angeles Collegian*. October 12, 1967.

79. Tozzi, Mike, editor-in-chief. *Pierce College Roundup*. March 31, 1967.

80. Trombley, William. "Raid Clouds Future of Promising University." *Los Angeles Times*. July 4, 1968.

81. Tropp, Rick. "For a Going College Community." *The New York City College Alumnus* 63: 12-14; March 1968.

82. University of California. *University Bulletin* 24: 115-116; February 26, 1968.

83. Walsh, Lawrence E. *Alumni Recommendations for the Future Government and Operation of Columbia University*. New York: Alumni Federation of Columbia University, Inc., August 15, 1968.

84. Walton, Sid. "Student Power in America: An Assessment." *College and University Business*, Special Issue, August 1968.

85. Ware, Claude. *Student Power . . . Black and White—Implications for Educational Administration and the Political Role of the Teacher*. Los Angeles: Los Angeles City College, 1968. Mimeo.

86. *Washington Post*. August 22, 1968.

87. Webster, Robert W. *Student Behavior: Then and Now*. Term paper, Education 470C, Los Angeles: University of California, July 30, 1968. Typed.

88. Wilcox, Preston R. "The School and the Community." *CAP/School Seminar Papers*. Trenton, New Jersey: Community Action Training Institute, May 1968.